

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CCXXI.]

MAY, 1863.

[Vol. XIX.]

PROTESTANT REFUGEES IN ENGLAND.*

No. II. THE DUTCH CHURCH.

To the enumeration of new trades and improvements in old ones which we owe to Holland and Germany, given in our last chapter, may be added the introduction into the Staffordshire Potteries of white ornamented china and unglazed red porcelain. Until nearly the close of the 17th century the supply of these articles depended entirely on the East India Company. Two brothers, named Elers, from Nürnberg, by some means discovered, in the vicinity of Burslem, a bed of clay of a beautiful red colour and peculiarly fine in its grain. They established in 1690 a pottery at Bradwell, near Burslem, and succeeded in producing effective imitations of Indian china. Mixing the red earth of the district with a little ochreous clay, they manufactured in that colour porcelain tea-pots. By the addition of manganese, they produced black porcelain or Egyptian ware.† Their success shewed how desirable and advantageous was the combination of

* Continued from p. 207.

† The guide-books of the Potteries give this romantic account of the circumstances which drove the brothers Elers from Bradwell. They tried with jealous care to keep their manufacturing processes strictly secret, relying for protection on their own jealous care rather than on patent laws. All strangers were forbidden to enter their works. They sought their "hands" among the most ignorant and stupid of the peasantry. The thrower's wheel was turned by a poor idiot. Each workman was locked up in his own department of the manufactory, and the persons of all were examined before they were permitted to leave the premises at night. These precautions only increased the eager desire of their neighbours and rivals in trade to penetrate the secrets of their manufactory. Two working men, named Twyford and Astbury, carried into successful operation a plot. The burthen of it rested on Astbury. Both obtained work at the manufactory. Twyford affected a stolid indifference to all the curious processes going on around him. Astbury played the part of an idiot, and bore month after month the indignities of his fellow-workmen. Behind that veil of stolid imbecility was concealed quick observation of every manufacturing process. In the evening he jotted down whatever he had learned during the day, or constructed rude models of the machinery he had seen at work. After two years of endurance and watchfulness, he knew that his object was attained. Putting less restraint on himself than before, he became an object of suspicion to his employers; and they, fearing he was less of an idiot than they had supposed, dismissed him. When the two spies set up rival works at Shelton, the brothers Elers, disgusted at the discovery of their secret, quitted Staffordshire and removed to London. The path which these ingenious Germans first discovered was afterwards trodden by Josias Wedgwood, the memory of whose name, enterprize and genius, is deservedly honoured by his countrymen.

beauty with utility in the ware of the potter, and materially affected the after prosperity of the district.

It has been stated that during the reign of Mary the services of the Dutch Protestants at Austin Friars were suspended. Gerdes, in his *Introductio in Historiam Evangelii renovati* (a work the study of which would have enriched many historical and biographical works issued during the last hundred years), gives a short and interesting letter (Vol. III. p. 137), bearing date Feb. 1554, from Peter Deloen, the pastor of the church, to his friend à Lasco. In it he says, "It has seemed desirable and necessary up to this time to remain amongst the English brethren, as well from a regard to the plentiful harvest of souls as from the great lack of labourers in the harvest, and the remarkable avidity of the people (on whom it is a pleasant task to spend one's pains) to hear the word. I desire to have your permission for some time yet to continue with the English brethren in their affliction, though my residence here is at the peril of my life." Instead of London, this letter bears the date of "Ungrateful Jerusalem, or, if you will like it better, Capernaum of old." As the departure of foreign Protestants had been proclaimed six months before this letter was written, and as at the same time all Protestant preaching had been prohibited by a royal proclamation, the continuance of Deloen at his post was certainly a dangerous duty. It is probable that he soon after followed the members of his flock and went abroad.

In the Diary of Henry Machyn, published by the Camden Society, under the date 1557 is this entry: "The xxiiij day of June was goodly serves (service) kept at the Frere Austins by the marchande strangers as has bene sene." As the persecution of the Protestants "ragged with redoubled fury" (Froude, VI. 469) during the spring and summer of 1557 (the bodies of the dead being in some cases disinterred and burnt in their coffins, together with Protestant books of devotion and Bibles), it can scarcely be supposed that the passage relates to Protestant service. The diarist was not a Protestant in feeling, and was not likely to know or record anything of a secret meeting of Protestant strangers for worship. We may therefore regard the statement as referring simply to a single celebration of mass or some other Romish service. The building was evidently not in use as a place of worship on Elizabeth's accession.

The re-establishment of the Dutch strangers in their church in Austin Friars was not unattended by difficulties. The Queen, ever jealous of parting with any of her prerogatives, objected to that portion of the patent which gave to the Dutch church the powers of a corporate body. The renewal of the gift made by Edward VI. of the freehold of the church, the yard and the land on which the ministers' houses stood, was made a difficulty. The Lord Treasurer, the Marquis of Winchester, possessed the rest

of this ecclesiastical property, and had his dwelling upon a part of the land where the Friary stood. Of religious feeling he was devoid, and his influence was used that "as little of that monastery as might be should escape his hands." Eventually the various difficulties were overcome, and the strangers were indulged in the enjoyment of their place of worship and their patent rights. In all their troubles they looked to Bishop Grindal (the "Good Algrind" of Spenser's *Eclogue*) as their advocate and friend.

For the direction of the foreign churches planted in England certain rules were promulgated in the Latin tongue. A copy of this document is given by Strype in his Appendix to the Life of Archbishop Parker. It enjoins on the ministers the preservation of pure doctrine and discipline. It recognizes four kinds of church officers,—pastors, learned men (*docti*) or teachers, elders and deacons. The pastors were to be elected by the ministers and elders of each church, whether French or Dutch; then to be proposed to the people and examined; the election to be ratified by the Bishop of the diocese. The candidate was to make a public profession of his faith in the presence of the teachers and elders of the church, and then to give a specimen of his learning on the Lord's-day in the presence of the people. Satisfactory testimonials of his life were required. Eight days were to be allowed after his preaching for the declaration of any objection to him. Then the Bishop was to confirm his election. A monthly meeting of the ministers and elders was to be held for the transaction of ecclesiastical business. If differences arose respecting doctrine or discipline which could not be settled by any particular church, then counsel should be taken on the same in a convocation of the several churches. Once in three months, brotherly admonitions were to be made respecting life, character and doctrine. A list of offences not to be tolerated by the Church is specified, at the head of which stand heresy, schism and rebellion against ecclesiastical authority. Among the offences of a less intolerable kind, are specified new and unusual methods of handling scripture, the ventilation of strange discipline and vain opinions, and the neglect of study, especially of holy scripture. A minister guilty of the more serious offences was to be tried by the ministers and elders of his church, and if convicted was to be sent to the Bishop, and by him to be deprived of his office. The minister guilty of the lesser faults was to be subject to the treatment prescribed in Matthew xviii. The hours and days of service were prescribed. Sermons were to be delivered at nine in the morning and three in the afternoon. At one and two o'clock catechetical exercises were to be held. Every Tuesday at the hour of seven a public exposition of scripture was to be given, at which both ministers and elders were to take their turn. None were permitted to expound scripture but those approved by the officers of the church, but at the close of the exposition questions

might be asked, provided they kept within becoming limits. Any one wandering into needless and improper questions was to be rebuked by the presiding minister.

Viewed as a whole and in relation to the times in which they were put forth, these rules are deserving of commendation as judicious and liberal.

Early in the archiepiscopate of Parker, the Dutch Protestants of London had to invoke his aid in behalf of several of their brethren, members of the church in the Augustine Friars, who going to Flanders had been seized at Nieuport and brought before the Inquisition. They were solemnly adjured to renounce the Protestant faith. Remaining steadfast, they were doomed to die. The Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, the Master of Requests, and others of Elizabeth's Court, addressed themselves by letter to the magistrates of Furne on behalf of these prisoners for conscience' sake. "They certified therein," says Strype, "that these good men passed along in the highway without any misbehaving themselves or holding any dispute with any, and were innocent as to the committing anything against the laws of the country. That for their faith they might not be molested, living within the Queen's dominions, as the Queen had given free leave to foreigners in case of religion. They mentioned the command the Queen had given the subjects of the Low Countries coming into England, and carrying themselves modestly, should not be meddled withal. But that if they should deal too hardly with those of the religion who had submitted themselves to her Majesty and dwelt under her protection, she would be constrained to make the same measure to those of other nations. But she hoped and expected the contrary from the wisdom of these magistrates. This was dated July 26, 1560. These letters the magistrates at Furne sent to the King's council at Brussels. But they laboured to extenuate their authority, giving out that they were forged by some Lutherans, and so notwithstanding they resolved to proceed against these honest men according to the extremity of their laws, and in fine put them to death by strangling and burning."

What adds to the sadness of the story is, that one of the martyrs was an unmarried and probably young woman, whose name was Adriana Skoningks. The names of her fellow-sufferers were James Diasdert and Christian de Queker. We know from the Dutch historians that neither sex nor goodness was the slightest protection against the agents of the Inquisition. Of all of them in the Netherlands, Peter Titelman, who executed his infamous task throughout Flanders, was the most cruel and merciless. The strangling before exposure to the fire was a mitigation of the horrors of martyrdom generally reserved for those who at the last moment renounced their heresy. But the sufferers for whom our countrymen pleaded were steadfast to the end.

Had the inquisitors of Brussels been familiar with our ecclesiastical history, they might have retorted on their correspondents that England had not always nor long respected the religious liberty of foreigners, and that a few years previously twenty-four Dutchmen had been haled to the fire in England for the crime of being Anabaptists! And Latimer, alluding to the fact in one of his sermons, though he bore testimony to the intrepidity and even cheerfulness with which these poor strangers went to their death, could only add these un pitying words, "Well, let them go."

We find Bishop Grindal writing, in Nov. 1561, to the magistrates of Frankfort in behalf of the Dutch Protestants there, who were threatened with expulsion on account of their refusal of the Augustan Confession in the matter of the eucharist. Thus pathetically did the Bishop plead their cause:

"If you should eject these brethren, they must of necessity fall into the hands of the butchers of antichrist. For whither, miserable men, shall they fly? Cast out by you, they will nowhere in Germany be received. In France, things are still unsettled. If they should wish to come through to us, where they would be received with outstretched arms, such a multitude must needs be intercepted in the way. For but lately some brethren of our German church in London, who had set out for Flanders as secretly and quietly as possible, were caught and burnt to death."—Grindal's Remains, p. 251.

It will surprise no one at all acquainted with the history of the Netherlands, that the strangers who fled from the tyranny of Philip and his bloodthirsty inquisitors, and found in England an asylum, should be impatient of spiritual repression, and should indulge in even daring religious speculations with which their protectors in this country felt little sympathy. The people of the Netherlands, then "the most energetic and quick-witted people of Europe," had learned to detest as much as they had formerly despised the ignorant and brutal friars, who were an incubus equally on the morals and on the productive industry of their country. They were not prepared to yield an unhesitating obedience to the hierarchy whom they found ruling with a much more rational and gentle sway in the country of their adoption. In the exercise of their national industry and in the pursuit of commerce, they had gained habits of intellectual activity and freedom which precluded willing conformity to all spiritual despotism. Commerce brings about other exchanges than those of material products. The freest and boldest thoughts known in Europe in the sixteenth century had been imported and had become current not merely in the busy cities, but in the quieter valleys, where this thoughtful and virtuous race of men were carrying on their peaceful and profitable labours. Men and women who for freedom of conscience had risked their lives and actually sacrificed country and fortune, were not disposed for

implicit conformity in their new abode. They consequently, as Strype intimates, cost Bishop Grindal, under whose superintendence they had been placed, some trouble. A few months after his entrance on the duties of his see, he received a supplication from some of the Dutch sojourners in the metropolis, asking for the free exercise of their religion, differing as it did in some points from that of his Church. The document was drawn up in the Dutch tongue, but had no signatures. The Bishop suspected that it was the work of Adrian Hamsted, and was designed to procure toleration for the sect of the Anabaptists. He communicated his suspicions, together with a copy of the petition, in a letter to Deloen and Utenhov, the other ministers of the Dutch church, telling them—"He, as I am informed, was once heard to say that he wished to write a supplication to me in the name of the Anabaptists. I think, therefore, that I shall be taking the shortest method if I direct my reply to Adrian himself, that he may have it delivered to those anonymous brethren. I have determined, however, to vouchsafe no reply to them without first consulting you, who know the depths of this sect better than I do, by reason of your long experience of them."

The course pursued by Hamsted discloses some qualities worthy of our admiration. He disclaimed participation in the doctrines of the Anabaptists. One of the doctrines of this sect was of a mystical character respecting the incarnation. They asserted that Christ took not flesh of the Virgin Mary, but brought it down from heaven. This doctrine was resented by others, who supposed it to undermine the office of Christ as a Mediator. They believed in and even worshiped Christ, and expected salvation by him. Hamsted pleaded for the toleration of these men, and argued that their opinions were not inconsistent with a firm faith in Jesus Christ as the Mediator and their Saviour. However he might differ from them, he would not condemn them, but would commit them to the judgment of God. In the course of his argument, he asserted that Christ's incarnation could not be proved by scripture, and that the doctrine that Christ partook of a human nature was not a fundamental doctrine or one essential to salvation. On another subject he is said to have held that it was allowable to members of the Reformed Church to keep back their children for some years from baptism, and that the time of celebrating it might be left to the conscience. For that age, the toleration for which Hamsted pleaded was large and admirable. He would not have men in whom the fear of God manifestly dwelt, harshly pressed to conformity with the doctrines of the Church; he said that if they were wrong they would yield their errors to the force of scripture and persuasion, and that spite of their errors they belonged to Christ and were members of the church.

Hamsted was in advance of the age in which he lived and the

particular church of which he was one of the pastors. The Bishop of London censured and excommunicated him. The Dutch church of St. Augustine were greatly troubled by the heresy of their pastor, and wrote for counsel to Peter Martyr, then at Zurich. That learned man sent in reply an elaborate letter censuring the opinions of Hamsted, and himself for troubling the church with them. He advised the church to put aside their dissensions and the errors which had given birth to them. Those dissensions he traced to the Evil One, whose envy was aroused by the sight of God's mercy in planting a French and Dutch church in England, and who hoped to defeat the counsels of God by making the strangers hateful to those amongst whom they were planted. Adrian Hamsted he counselled to bear the rebuke of his superior, as Peter did that of Paul. The Dutch church he counselled to treat their erring pastor with tenderness, and if he acquiesced in the decision of the church, to embrace him still as a pastor and teacher. But Hamsted was proof, where he thought truth was concerned, equally against rebuke and entreaty.

We find in the History of Gerdes some documents bearing on this part of the history of the Dutch church in England, which are of considerable interest, and have escaped the notice of previous writers. One is an Apology for Hamsted from the pen of the learned and brave Acontius. Of this document, which bears as much on his own position as that of Hamsted, we defer speaking till the case of Acontius himself comes before us. Another document is a letter from Charles Utenhovius, bearing date Antwerp, May, 1561, and addressed to his kinsman, John Utenhovius, one of the pastors at Austin Friars. In it he laments in feeling terms the excommunication of Hamsted, a proceeding which he characterizes as based on inadequate if not on frivolous grounds. "If," said the writer, "he holds opinions differing from ours, it is on matters of such small importance that surely you might well have borne with him. This is the judgment of those here whose opinion is of any value. All are indignant at the accusations brought against him and at his excommunication." Utenhovius writes as if Hamsted were then with him, saying, "He sends his regards to Acontius and Deloen."

A letter from Hamsted to Acontius, bearing date June 14, 1561, next claims attention. He tells his friend that great as his calamities had been, they had not inspired the wish to return to England. Having once escaped from that prison, he had no wish to return to it. Where he was he had peace and contentment. That which chiefly troubled him was that he could find no suitable employment and had few books. He had taken to agriculture, and sometimes amused himself with travelling about on foot. He preferred this idleness to the angry work of controversy in which his friend was engaged. He refers more than once, and

in touching terms, to the troubles through which both had had to pass, and thanks God for his grace in enabling them to put on the likeness of Jesus Christ. He consoles himself with the reflection also that his enemies had not been able to inflict greater injuries on him.

“When I was banished from England, Holland would not permit me to remain as her guest. Emden cast me out a wanderer. As to England, I never wished to establish myself there, or to engage myself to the church there, however eagerly my services were desired. Nor was it my purpose to remain long amongst the Dutch. They persecuted me in my departure and flight. The cumbrousness of my baggage retarded my progress at first. But they soon lightened me of this trouble. The people of Emden drove me and my family to seek another abode. I admit that I had no legal right to settle there. As to the persons who, while they admit that they cannot confute my opinions, declare they will shew me no favour unless I retract them, and that they will feel little regard for me when I do retract, I acknowledge their *benevolence*. But so far from retracting in order to gain their good will, I would rather renounce friendship itself than utter a word at variance with the testimony of God and my conscience. They perhaps are my friends, but the truth of God is much more my friend. Their good will is of little consequence. I will rather act up to the command of Christ, If thine eye offend thee, pluck it out and cast it from thee. As to what you say about the way being still open to me to return to England, I am not, my friend, influenced by any great desire to return. I care little for sensual gratifications. I expect and wait to see where God is pleased to call me. Many persons here attended my ministry; but when I perceived that little gain to Christ's kingdom was likely to accrue from my labours, I resolved to desist. That my enemies accuse me of Arianism is nothing new. . . . It is no new thing for them to attempt to blacken my character by falsehood. But, in truth, I know nothing of the errors of Arius, except from the relation of others. Let them, then, lie as they will; God will in his own time vindicate my innocence. There is no occasion, my Acontius, why you indulge the fear that, goaded by the hatred and false charges of my enemies, I shall embrace opinions hostile to the truth. Since I have to take up my cross, it is my desire to bear it in behalf of truth and conscience. It is not my wish to rival my opponents in reproachful words, strife and the use of unfair arguments. I have no wish to feel angry myself or to irritate them. I have learnt from the Master not to return evil for evil, but rather to conquer by patience, and to him that strikes me on one cheek to turn the other. Poor indeed would be my consolation in the midst of trouble, if I felt that I was supporting my cause with an evil and accusing conscience. Be this crime far from me! I pray to God that he will not permit me to fall into that degree of madness.

“Yours entirely, and with all my heart,

“*ADR. HAMBSTED.*”

Our readers will perceive, even from this slight and imperfect sketch of the letter, the noble qualities of this brave confessor. His firmness was the more admirable as he seems to have been of a sensitive nature. We learn from Gerdes (*Introd. in Hist.*

Evang. Ref., III.) that he was induced to return to England. He did not on his arrival make his presence known to the Bishop. But when Grindal heard of his being in London, he caused proceedings to be taken anew against him, and offered him a form of retraction, and entreated him to sign it that he might be purged of his heresy. This document (in Latin) is preserved in the Appendix to the Life of the Bishop. It contains a statement of the opinions of Hamsted; but as he declined to subscribe it, we must hesitate in receiving it, and can only regard it as a hostile document. The refusal to subscribe was doubtless grounded in part on the incorrectness of the statements of his doctrine. The heresies which he was called upon to retract are stated under six heads, and have been already alluded to. In addition, he was asked to admit that he had condemned the ministers of both churches when admonishing him of his errors, and even the superintending Bishop; and that further he had contumaciously appealed to the law, and had charged his colleagues with an irregular, unjust and unlawful deposition and excommunication.

The refusal of Hamsted to listen to the Bishop's proposals cut him off entirely from the Dutch church in England, and he became again a wanderer for conscience' sake in the autumn of 1562. The retraction was offered him on the last day of July. On the 19th of August came the peremptory order for him to quit England. His wanderings were now near their end, for, according to Gerdes, he died in that same year, soon after his return to the Netherlands. The historian, while he censures his intemperate zeal, commends his piety and love of truth and the faithfulness with which he followed his light. He expresses regret that milder measures were not adopted towards one who had done good service to the church of Christ, having at one time at Antwerp preached the word, amid general commendation, to a church consisting of 2000 persons. Strype gives him credit for learning, sobriety and piety, and for having done and suffered much under the cross both in England and previously in Zealand. The historian alleges that he had a tendency to Arian as well as Anabaptistical errors, but nothing alleged in the form of retraction justifies this statement. If he held the doctrine of the incarnation loosely, it seemed to be rather in respect to the humanity than to the deity of Christ. Mr. Wallace, and before him Mr. Lindsey, saw fit to admit him into their lists of Antitrinitarian worthies, but, so far as we can discover, on no other authority than this general statement of Strype. Whether Hamsted were orthodox or heretical in this matter we know not; but if the former, the greater be his praise for his moderation towards those who differed from him, and for his courage in maintaining his own religious liberty as well as asserting that of others. The only work which Hamsted is known to have published was, in 1559, a Martyrology, in a 4to volume of 450 pages. It was the

earliest work on this subject in the Dutch language, and is now an exceedingly rare book.

Some members of the Dutch church of London approved of the opinions and course of Hamsted; but they were dealt with by the Bishops of London and Durham, and were called upon to renounce publicly their error and profess their repentance.

The name of another and a still more celebrated man, also suspected of heresy, connected with the Dutch church in London, has been already mentioned—JAMES ACONTIUS.* He was born in the early part of the sixteenth century at Trent, a city in the Tyrol, the place which gave its name to the celebrated Council of the Latin Church (1542—1564) convoked to put down the Reformation. Cheynell states that he knew him to be alive in 1613, but the statement is scarcely credible. He was educated for the profession of the law, and spent some years in a court. He was a diligent and accomplished student. Besides being versed in mathematics, theology and general literature, he had acquired the knowledge of military engineering. His abandonment of the Catholic faith, in which he had been educated, compelled him in 1557 to quit his native land. Accompanied by Francis Betti, he proceeded to Switzerland. At Zurich he associated with Frisius, Simler, Jo. Wolf and other distinguished men. We find in the Zurich letters the name of Acontio once or twice associated with that of the illustrious Bernardine Ochino. They were doubtless acquainted, and had met at Strasburg or Zurich. In that spring time of the Reformation, the influence which one advanced mind had over others tending in the same direction often led to important results. That Ochino had ceased to be quite orthodox on the subject of the Trinity even before he quitted the Church of Rome, is clear from several facts stated in the biographies of him. In January 1559, Jewel, writing to Peter Martyr from Strasburg (his asylum during the Marian persecution), mentions that Acontius and Betti were in that city. In May 1560, the Bishop, writing from London, speaks of Acontius as being then with the Earl of Bedford. This was Francis, the second Earl, the friend of Underhill and the correspondent of Bradford the martyr. The Earl was for a short time himself a prisoner in the Fleet on account of religion, and also was at Zurich, where he shared the society and councils of the Protestant refugees.† On the accession of Elizabeth, he was named one of her Protestant counsellors, and he continued his friendship

* His name is frequently given in its Italian form, Aconcio. In De Feller's *Biographie Universelle*, it is said that the real name was Giacomo Cantio.

† Collins, in his *Peerage*, states, however, that the Earl of Bedford took part in proclaiming Mary, and in vindicating in arms her claims against those of Lady Jane Grey. He also states that he served in Mary's army in the war with France, and assisted in the taking of the town of St. Quintin, August 10, 1557. As a soldier, as well as one of the Reformed religion, the Earl would have a twofold sympathy with Acontius.

towards the more earnest of the reformers. It was probably through the influence of the Earl of Bedford that Acontius was introduced to the Queen's notice, and received from her a small pension on account of his engineering knowledge. He joined the church at Austin Friars, and seems to have shared soon after the censures which the Bishop passed upon Hamsted. That he did not acquiesce in the judgment of the superintendent of the church, we are able to prove from a document already referred to, the existence of which seems hitherto unknown to his biographers. There is happily preserved in the *Scrinium Antiquarium* of Gerdes (III. 123—133) an apologetical letter written by Acontius to Bishop Grindal in behalf of his excommunicated friend, Adrian Hamsted. Interesting as this document is as a proof of the talent and fine moral qualities of Acontius, we must content ourselves with a brief statement of its principal allegations, with here and there a passage (freely translated) entire. The date given is, we suppose, conjectural, 1562 or 1563.

Acontius alleges that Hamsted entirely denied that he had taught or uttered some of the things charged upon him; with respect to others he declared he had not spoken them in the sense in which they had been understood. Acontius pleads that he ought not himself to suffer and be denied admission to the Lord's Supper on account of his defence of Hamsted, because that defence, based on a denial of the truth of the charges brought against the latter, did not imply the complicity of Acontius in the heresy imputed to the other. The controversy respecting the orthodoxy or otherwise of Hamsted rested much, he alleges, on the use of the word "circumstantia." Acontius had pleaded for a different interpretation of that word from that which his accusers put upon it. He thus interprets the creed of Hamsted:

"I regard Christ as the foundation itself of salvation. But that Christ was born of the seed of the woman, &c., this is not the foundation, i. e. it is not Christ himself. And this narrative, this declaration, does not contain the entire narrative respecting Christ; but is a certain circumstance of the foundation, i. e. of many articles of which the entire history and doctrine of Christ consists—it is only one, not all. Hence he who denies that Christ was born of the seed of the woman, does not deny the foundation, but denies one of the circumstances of the foundation. That is to say, he who denies this article of the incarnation, does not deny all the articles, but one only."

Acontius also takes the ground that a man cannot be said to deny anything who does not himself perceive and intend the denial. He declares that with the exception of this matter of Hamsted, no one could truly charge him with having, either in England or elsewhere, stirred up controversy on religious dogmas. He makes reference to a discourse which he had published in the Italian language, entitled, "The Sum or Substance of the Christian Religion," which was well known to the churches of

Zurich and all in the Netherlands conversant with Italian works. That summary, he alleges, does not in a single word dissent from the dogmas accepted by the churches he had named. He argues strongly against putting extreme interpretations on a writer's words. Without the application of both good sense and charity in the interpretation of a writer's thoughts, there is no one who may not be made chargeable with folly and blasphemy. He instances such texts as "That which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast" (Ecclesiastes iii. 19). "The race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong, neither yet bread to the wise, nor yet riches to men of understanding, nor yet favour to men of skill; but time and chance happeneth to them all" (Ecclesiastes ix. 11). Texts like these, harshly interpreted, might be represented as denying religion altogether.

When he was questioned on the article of the Incarnation, he said he neither denied nor asserted that it was the very essence (heart or brain) of Christianity, the knowledge and belief of which were absolutely necessary to salvation. He said he had not hitherto discovered it, and that on such a matter he would rather learn from others than be a teacher of other men. He was willing to listen and study, and when he ascertained what was certainly necessary for faith, he would profess it.

All this he had given in in writing the year before, and had learnt with regret from Cossin, the French minister, that his explanations had not satisfied the Bishop. But he was at that time unable to go further into the question, being necessitated to undertake a voyage to a distant country. When on his return he found himself excluded from the Lord's Supper in the Italian church, he had earnestly sought for scripture proofs on the subject of the necessity to salvation of this article of the Incarnation, and had added his earnest entreaties to the Bishop to help him to discover a solution of his difficulties. He cited, as an authority for his position, Zwingle, who maintained that salvation was possible, not only for those who had not right conceptions respecting this article, but also for Socrates and other heathens, who were altogether ignorant of the gospel. As a proof that right notions are not necessary to admission to the Lord's Supper, he points to the case of the apostles themselves, who by their inquiry, "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" shewed that they did not comprehend that the kingdom of Christ was not carnal, but spiritual.

The letter closes thus:

"But I cannot sufficiently express my wonder at this; though I a foreigner am not permitted to partake of the communion with foreign churches, the English churches not only permit it, but unless I came up of my own accord, invite and compel it. Nor do they do this only

in the case of persons like myself, but with a great number of persons dissenting from the true doctrine of the gospel not on one point only, but on all. I would gladly understand in what light the Lord Bishop looks upon his own churches. Because if he finds himself prevented from reforming them according to his own wishes, how is it that he cannot, for the sake of avoiding many and great scandals in a foreign church, bear with me and grant me dispensation? I beseech him earnestly by Jesus Christ to do this.

"JAC. ACONTIUS."

It would almost seem from passages in this apologetical letter that Acontius had, after the affair of the excommunication of Hamsted, ceased his relations to the Dutch church, and that he sought communion either with the French or Italian church. How long he continued in England does not appear. While here he associated with J. B. Castalio, the instructor of Queen Elizabeth in Italian, and one who had acquired considerable influence at that monarch's court. Castalio translated from the Italian into Latin the treatise of his friend, entitled, "An Exhortation to the Fear of God." The translation was dedicated to Elizabeth.

In 1565, Acontius printed and published at Basle a very singular and unorthodox book, entitled, "*Stratagematum Satanæ, Libri Octo, Jacobo Acontio autore;*" "*The Stratagems of Satan, in Eight Books, by James Acontius.*" It is dedicated to Queen Elizabeth in the courtier-like terms of that era, and the dedication refers to the share which the writer had enjoyed of her liberality, and to his consequent leisure for literature when an exile in England on account of his profession of evangelical truth. The grammatical form of this dedication seems to imply that the writer was not at the time of writing in England. The account which Mr. Hallam gives of this book is characterized by that author's instructive precision. After describing the "*Stratagems*" as written in the spirit of Castalio,* he thus proceeds:

"It deserves some notice in the history of opinions, because it is perhaps the first wherein the limitation of fundamental articles of Christianity to a small number is laid down at considerable length. He instances among doctrines which he does not reckon fundamental, those of the real presence and of the Trinity; and in general such as are not either expressed in scripture or deducible from it by unequivocal reasoning. Aconcio inveighs against capital punishments for heresy; but his

* Mr. Hallam attributes the treatise, "*De Hæreticis, an sint persequendi,*" &c., published in 1553 with the pseudonym of "*Martin Bellius,*" to Castalio. For this statement he had some authority from Beza and Calvin. It is objected that the style is not that of Castalio, and that the treatise contains a quotation from Castalio. Bock and Ilgen allege that Lælius Socinus was its author, and also give Beza as their authority for the opinion. Beza and Calvin seem to have attributed it to the joint authorship of Castalio and L. Socinus. Mr. Wallace, in his *Antitrinitarian Biography*, assents to this judgment. Having mentioned the name of Socinus, it may be suggested that he and Acontius possibly met at Zurich, or some other part of Switzerland, before the latter came to England. From his accomplished countrymen he might receive that tendency to free religious speculation which ripened into heresy.

argument, like that of Castalio, is good against every minor penalty. 'If the clergy,' he says, 'once get the upper hand and carry this point, that as soon as one opens his mouth, the executioner shall be called in to cut all throats with his knife, what will become of the study of scripture? They will think it very little worth while to trouble their heads with it; and if I may presume to say so, will set up every fancy of their own for truth. O unhappy times! O wretched posterity! if we abandon the arms by which alone we can subdue an adversary.' Acontio was not improbably an Arian; this may be surmised not only because he was an Italian Protestant and because he seems to intimate it in some passages of his treatise, but on the authority of Strype, who mentions him as reputed to be such, while belonging to a small congregation of refugees in London."—*Literature of Europe*, II. 114, 115.

In another place, Mr. Hallam writes,—

"Acontius developed larger principles" (i.e. than previous writers most strenuous for toleration), "distinguishing the fundamental from the accessory doctrines of the gospel; which, by weakening the associations of bigotry, prepared the way for a catholic tolerance."—III. 102.

The *Stratagems of Satan* immediately attracted attention in many quarters. It was in the very year of its publication translated into French, and published at Basle under the title, "*Les Ruses de Satan*." Possibly the translation was executed under the inspection of the author, and received improvements from his hand. De Bure describes it as "*Traduction plus recherchée que l'original Latine*." Episcopius praised the "*Stratagems*" in the highest terms, and said that the Remonstrants of Holland trod closely in his steps. Ramus spoke admiringly of the various and profound accomplishments of Acontius, as well as of his humanity and grace; and having recommended his "*Stratagems*" to the perusal of certain divines among his countrymen, says they exceedingly admired the beauty of the language and the skill of the discourse. Commenius spoke of him as a most excellent man, and one disgusted with the wretched cacoethes scribendi of his age. Salden, a Dutch divine, applied to Acontius what was once said of Origen—"Where he writes well, no one does better; where ill, no one does worse." John Goodwin translated the first four books of the "*Stratagems*" in 1647, and in dedicating his translation said that he had not met with any author comparable to Acontius, in respect to Christian genius and dexterity, in the art of dethroning errors in men's judgments, as well as in composing differences as far as the honour of truth will admit. John Dury, the earnest pacificator of religious differences, in a letter to Mr. Samuel Hartlib, describes Acontius as an excellent man, thoroughly knowing in many sciences, possessed of depth and solidity of judgment, united with piety and moderation.* In one of the essays read before the Non-Con Club

* Cheynell intimates in his "*Divine Trinunity*" that Dury was afterwards willing to retract his praise, being convinced that in his desire for peace he had been led beyond the lines of orthodoxy.

in 1821, and printed in the *Monthly Repository*, Mr. Matthew Davenport Hill (now the learned and humane Recorder of Birmingham), in an elaborate panegyric upon Acontius, expresses the opinion that from him our own Milton drew the inspiration of the finest passages of his *Areopagitica*. On the other hand, Acontius has been denounced, in terms more or less severe, by a succession of writers in whose view heresy obliterates all merit, whether of morals or literature. Gallasius, in a letter to Calvin (1561), complains of Acontius as not orthodox, and describes him as one of those persons who wish their words to be regarded as oracular, and although they fall into the greatest errors, yet acquire thereby a kind of false glory, as though they saw farther than other men, and could penetrate even abstruse mysteries. Voetius said he was but one remove from a Socinian. Paræus called him a sneaking solicitor for the Socinians; and the coarse bigotry of Cheynell said, "Acontius thought fit to lay aside the ancient confessions of faith and compose a new creed which Socinians may subscribe. He came into England under a fair pretence of being banished for Christ's sake, but certainly his greatest danger was of being called into question for his intimate confederacy with such as were no great friends of Jesus Christ."

But not content with denunciation, when John Goodwin put forth his English translation of the larger part of Acontius's book, Cheynell, taking advantage of his post of commissioner for looking after pernicious and dangerous books, denounced the work to the Assembly of Divines. The Assembly immediately appointed a Committee to peruse the book, and to make their report thereon. Mr. Dury was added to the Committee, but found himself unable, even if he had the will, to withstand the clamour raised against the author whose book he had commended. To Cheynell the Committee entrusted the work of drawing up the report; and it was presented to the Assembly March 8th, 1647-8, in these terms:

"We humbly conceive that Acontius his enumeration of points necessary to be known and believed for the attainment of salvation is very defective.

"I. Because in the creed which Acontius framed there is no mention made either of the Godhead of Jesus Christ or of the Godhead of the Holy Ghost. And

"II. Although Acontius doth acknowledge Christ to be truly the Son of God, yet he doth not in his creed declare him to be the natural Son of God.

"That these points are necessary to be known and believed for the attainment of salvation, is, in our judgment, clearly expressed in the Holy Scriptures, 1 John v. 7, 20, compared with John xvii. 3.

"We do therefore conceive that Acontius was justly condemned, because he maintains that the points of doctrine which he mentions are the only points which are necessary to be known and believed, and did not hold forth or mention the points aforesaid as necessary to salvation.

“And we esteem him to be the more worthy of censure, because he lived in an age when the Photinian heresie was revived, and yet spared the Photinians, though he condemned the Sabellians.

“Finally, Acontius doth cautelously decline the orthodox expressions of the ancient Church in the four first general Synods; and doth deliver his creed in such general expressions that, as we conceive, the Socinians may subscribe it, and yet retain the worst of their blasphemous errors.

“The premises being humbly presented, we leave it to the judgment of this reverend Assembly, whether Acontius his *Stratagems*, was a book fit to be translated into English, and recommended to the parliament, army and city, to direct them how to distinguish truth from error in this juncture of time.”

It was probably a mortification to Cheynell's fierce bigotry that no proceedings were directed to be taken by the Assembly against the translator; but a sop was thrown to his vanity by an unanimous vote that the Prolocutor should endeavour to persuade Cheynell to print something on the subject of Acontius and his errors.

The reader unacquainted with the work of Acontius may, on perusing it with the recollection of what its critics have said about it, rise from the task with a little feeling of disappointment. No Socinian, if there be such a person at the present day, would, we suppose, feel himself at liberty to subscribe every article of the confession of faith which Acontius recommended. We propose, however, to enable our readers to judge for themselves, by giving them a translation from some passages in the 7th book of the *Stratagems*, in which the writer discloses his theological opinions and bias more clearly than in other parts of his book. We take our translation from an edition in 12mo, published at Oxford in 1631.* The title-page is an engraved one. Above the actual title is a female figure, surrounded by clouds of incense, holding in each hand the olive-branch, an emblem of RELIGION. On the right of the title is a clothed female figure, also holding a branch in her left hand and a dove in her right. This is an emblem of CHARITY. TRUTH is represented by a naked figure, on the left of the title, holding a branch and the Book. Below is a figure of SATAN emerging from a cauldron of fire, and on a platform behind him are figures emblematic of PRIDE, ERROR, HERESY, HATRED, CALUMNY and SCHISM. Calumny is set forth in the person of a rabbi; the others are probably females, but Schism seems to wear the triple crown. The passages of which we offer a translation have not, so far as our knowledge goes, been previously rendered into English.

“Nothing, in my judgment, would be better than by the preparation of one carefully-constructed symbol to abolish all other confessions of

* Strangely enough, the writer of the life of Acontius in the *Biographical Dictionary of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge* questions the existence of this edition.

faith. Such a consent of the churches would certainly silence many little words of men, and would remove many and great causes of offence which in a wonderful degree obstruct the course of the gospel.

“There exists, indeed, under the title of the Apostles’ Creed, a symbol of faith of extreme antiquity. All approve of it, but in such a fashion that they fail to recognize its use. This symbol is, indeed, a kind of warlike signal, such as the Latins called *tessera* (a tablet with the watch-word inscribed), by which allies are distinguished from enemies and spies. On which account, though the Fathers have been pleased to style this symbol the shortest confession of faith, it is sufficiently clear that they purposed to make a like use of it, viz., that whosoever received it should be himself received, even though in other respects he should be involved in many and serious errors; and that he who rejected it should be himself rejected. But this is not the practice, as he who has professed this symbol is not himself accepted. And if he be not, it is manifest that it is not used as a symbol. It would, therefore, be well worth while to consider of what kind that confession of faith should be which could be rightly used among all Christian men (those, I mean, who in any way belong to the church of God) as a symbol of faith.”

After premising other remarks in the same strain, he suggests these as the necessary articles of such a creed. In the margin it is styled, “A Form of Belief according to the Author’s Views:”

“I. That there is one true God, and Jesus the Christ whom he has sent, and the Holy Spirit; and that it is rightly affirmed that the Father is different from the Son, since Jesus Christ is truly the Son of God.

“II. That man is exposed to the anger and judgment of God; and that the dead will be raised to life, the just to everlasting happiness, but the wicked to everlasting torments.

“III. That God sent his own Son Jesus Christ into the world, who being made man died for our sins, and for our justification (*justitia*) was raised from the dead.

“IV. That if we believe in the Son of God, we shall in his name obtain life.

“V. That there is no salvation in any other, neither in the Blessed Virgin, nor in Peter, nor Paul, nor in any saint, nor in any other by whatsoever name he may be called; and that there is no justification in the law, nor in the commands or inventions of men.

“VI. That there is one baptism in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.

“For the time to come this perchance may prove a not unsuitable formula for a symbol of faith:

“I acknowledge the one only true God, and him whom he hath sent, Jesus Christ, his Son, and the Holy Spirit.

“I acknowledge this to be the law of God: ‘Hear, oh Israel, the Lord thy God is one God,’ &c. Accursed is he who shall not do all things whatsoever which are written in the law.

“I believe that there will be a resurrection of the dead, and that the quick and dead will stand before the judgment; those who have done well will go to eternal life, but those who have acted unjustly to punishment.

“And since I was conceived in sin, and am by nature a child of

wrath, and have acted grievously against the law of God, I acknowledge that I am exposed to the judgment of God and am liable to eternal death. But since at the appointed time God sent his own Son Jesus Christ into the world, *who being made man died for our sins, and for our justification was brought to life again*,—who by his own blood cleansed us from our sins, by whom forgiveness of sins is proclaimed, nor is there salvation in any other, nor has there been any other name under heaven given to men by which we may be saved,—I consider that by his name and grace I shall obtain life.

“‘I acknowledge that there is one baptism in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.’ And if any one wishes it, the condemnation of those errors which conflict with the faith written above may be added in this fashion:—‘I reject the opinion of those who deny that the Son is different from the Father; for I confess that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.’

“‘I do not hold that justification is placed in the law, or in the commands or inventions of men, but in Christ alone. Nor do I hope that I shall be saved through the Blessed Virgin, or any saint, or any other name, but by Christ alone.’ But if it be desired that these things should be omitted, any one who professes the form may, especially when there is any suspicion, be asked whether he thus recognizes the Father and the Son; and so with regard to any other thing about which there is any suspicion, lest any one embracing the words should deny the thing which is signified by the words; in this, however (that the true use of the faith may be retained), care must be taken lest any one in putting such questions should require anything beyond the true sense of the symbol.

“And certainly if in any way a confession of faith of this kind could be prepared, which would give such satisfaction to all belonging to the universal church of God that they could regard it as fit for use as a symbol, and that all would be content with it, and exact no further confession, its usefulness would surpass the expectation of all men. And indeed, if any one rightly considers the matter, either this is the method of agreement among Christians, or, in short, there is none. For as long as each man shall wish his own judgment concerning all things to be the normal rule of faith to all others, and the law which every one must obey, then I should say that it will necessarily follow that all men will regard all men as heretics, and thus there will be no limit to sects, wranglings, clamour and hatred. But if men were once persuaded that all who profess that belief (whatever differences of opinion may continue on other points) are entitled to be embraced as Christians and brothers, and that notwithstanding these differences they are entitled to share the common rights of religion, there would be a good hope that in the end even those controversies themselves would be conducted with a greater degree of equanimity. In addition, as all enmities would be done away, adversaries would at length be reconciled, and all the occasions for uttering reproachful words would be prevented. That this may at last be brought about ought to be our earnest prayer to God.”

Acontius was the author of an epistle to Wolf on the Manner of publishing Books. It is included in the Oxford edition of the *Stratagems* (1631). He also published in 1558 a treatise on Method, or the Right Manner of studying and teaching the Sci-

ences. It is dedicated to his friend Betti* in these words: "The laborious and anxious employment in which we have long been engaged together, the similarity of our studies and inclinations, and, what is above all, our union of sentiment in religion, and the resolution which we have taken of abandoning our native country for the sake of it, have knit us together in the dearest and most indissoluble bonds of friendship." In this treatise Acontius points out the natural order of studying the sciences, and the steps by which the mind passes from the discovery of one truth to another. There is a remarkable passage in the work, which displays his penetration in anticipating subsequent to his own age great intellectual improvements and discoveries. "I perceive," he said, "that it is my lot to live in an exceedingly cultivated age; and yet I do not so much fear the decision of the present race of learned men, as I dread the rising light of a period still more cultivated than the present; for though the present century has produced, and still continues to produce, many eminent men, yet I think I perceive before us a degree of knowledge and refinement beyond our present conceptions."

There exists among the English State Papers a MS. treatise by Acontius in Italian, on the Use and Study of History. It is dedicated to Sir Robert Dudley, afterwards Earl of Leicester. Its existence would have probably remained still unknown, but for the volume of Calendars edited by Mr. Lemon, and published in 1856 under the direction of the Master of the Rolls. This is one of many proofs of the great practical value of that series of works.

The time of Acontius's death is supposed to have been about 1566. The statement of Cheynell of his being alive in 1613, would make him about 80 or 90 years of age, if not more. But with the proofs that exist of the activity of mind and the love of truth which characterized Acontius, we cannot imagine that if his life had been protracted he would have consented to let forty years or more pass without continuing his contributions to the literature of an age which possessed few men of greater ability or higher moral worth. According to Gerdes, he left his MSS. to J. Bapt. Castalio. The same writer describes him as possessed of scanty means, and as leading a frugal, laborious and self-denying life. Such has been, and will probably long continue to be, the lot of thousands of God's most faithful servants, the men who prefer truth to interest, and who decline, at the cost of conscientious self-respect, to echo the opinions of the noisy multitude.

(To be continued.)

* Of Francis Betti a short but interesting account is given by Mr. Wallace in the *Antitrinitarian Biography*, II. 135—137.

MERIT IN MAN AND MERCY IN GOD.

WHAT is merit? What is mercy? How are mercy and merit related to God and to man?

When a workman performs a day's labour faithfully and well and receives the day's wages, the payment of the employer is at once an acknowledgment of value received, a testimony to the merit of the workman, and a recognition of the great social and moral truth that the labourer is worthy of his hire, or is worth his wages.

When merit is ascribed to the poet, the painter or the sculptor, the orator, philanthropist or philosopher, some work has been so well performed as to gratify and benefit those who praise the work and pronounce the worker meritorious.

Merit, then, is social worth; it is something done by one individual that gratifies and benefits another or others, and consequently is a thing of social worth. And when that which is done stands forth in the graceful attitude of a purely gratuitous and spontaneous act, whose object is to relieve, remove or prevent suffering and distress, that act takes on the attribute and rises to the dignity of mercy.

Not, however, that merit and mercy are always convertible terms, for not unfrequently the former does not and cannot assume the characteristics and perform the functions of the latter.

Yet mercy is always meritorious; for in its necessary relation to social want it must always carry with it a certain amount of social worth.

A good Samaritan, with disinterested goodwill, relieves the distress and provides for the wants of a wayside sufferer who had fallen among thieves; and the good deed done evoked universal praise, and the good worker is by universal consent pronounced a man of mercy and of merit.

Good Florence Nightingale, with a willing mind and a generous heart, gives herself, and all her talents, energy and skill, wholly to the task of mitigating the misery and ministering to the wants of the Crimean sufferers; and the whole civilized world unite to laud the labour of love, and pronounce the great and good-hearted labourer a woman of marvellous mercy, merit and social worth.

In these and in all similar cases, the utterances of praise and the ascriptions of merit are verbal representatives of hearts that are gratified and gladdened and minds that are benefited by the sunny influences of an accomplished work of human mercy.

And in nature and aim mercy is always the same, although as she moves through the great social circle she presents various aspects and adopts various methods of accomplishing her divine mission, and observers accost and welcome her by divers designa-

tions. Now naming her compassion, then calling her charity, and not unfrequently grace is the appellation by which she is greeted.

When compassion renders gratuitous and willing relief to the sick and sorrowing, the destitute and despairing, compassion is mercy.

When charity, with disinterested goodwill, seeks to instruct the ignorant and reclaim the vicious in order to avert the miseries that ignorance and vice, if permitted to proceed, would bring in their train, charity is another name for mercy.

And when grace presents a free pardon to the transgressor in order to prevent the suffering that punishment would produce, that act of grace is an act of mercy.

Most readily, therefore, mercy accepts of any one of these designations, or all of them together, as individually and collectively signifying most distinctly what she is in herself and what is the special aim of her every effort; but by her very nature and aim she is utterly precluded from accepting compensation for her labour to diminish pain and sorrow, and multiply pleasure and joy.

She is a perfectly free labourer and can never be hired, nor could she under any circumstances whatever receive hire without ceasing to be mercy.

Let the true significance of merit and mercy in man be distinctly perceived, and little difficulty will attend the solution of the question, how are mercy and merit related to God and to man?

As all the faculties, powers and means which enable man to be merciful are derived from and are dependent upon "him who giveth unto all men life and breath and all things," mercy in man is mercy from God.

It is a measure of a divine attribute conferred by the Creator upon his human offspring to create for them an actual experience of what that divine attribute is in itself and in its relation to God and to man.

And that experience reveals the soul-inspiring truth that the application of purely gratuitous and voluntary means to the mitigation, removal or prevention of suffering, or to the rendering of suffering subservient to enjoyment, is mercy alike in God and in man.

The merciful man, therefore, may with the firmest and fullest confidence say, I know what mercy is in God, for I know what it is in myself, and mine is a portion of him.

Blessed, therefore, are the merciful, for it is theirs to obtain from God himself the means of working and his approval of their work.

Blessed are the merciful, for it is theirs to obtain grace and mercy to help in time of need.

Blessed are the merciful, for theirs is the sacred privilege of being fellow-workers with God.

Blessed are the merciful, for it is theirs to participate in a divine attribute of the Father, and thereby be made partakers of his divine nature.

But as this participation in the divine nature and this blessedness and all the blessings of existence are the gifts of God, and as all the merit humanity can acquire by the employment of those divine gifts is related solely to objects within the social circle, man's merit can be of no more worth to God than man's money.

Human beings may work together or separately for individual advantage or mutual good, but what work can a finite being perform, even when he is a fellow-worker with God, that can be advantageous and do good to him who is infinitely rich and mighty, infinitely good and wise and blessed?

Let man work as he will and do as much good as possible, and be largely merciful and highly meritorious and of great social worth, and let him, in the fulness and power of true faith and ardent love of God and man, religiously discharge every duty and worship the Father in spirit and in truth, and make it his meat and his drink to do the Father's will, yet in reference to God he is and must be an unprofitable servant.

As possible would it be for the earth to enlighten and warm the sun as for man to confer any benefit or favour upon God, or to become in any way whatever profitable to him.

For the blessings and mercies of the Father in heaven, for what he gives and for what he forgives, nothing whatever can be given to him in exchange.

Of his own spontaneous goodness he gives his human family their daily bread, and feeds and clothes them and provides and cares for them continually, asking nothing for himself, and laying upon them no other conditions than that they faithfully employ for their own and one another's good the means which he supplies, and cherish gratitude for these means and the results which they produce.

And from the same spontaneous goodness he forgives transgressors and pardons sinners, provided only that they repent of their offences and forgive trespasses committed against themselves. And by his chosen messenger of mercy to man he offers the clearest possible illustration of the manner in which he exercises his mercy and grace, and the mode by which offenders may obtain forgiveness of their sins.

For this purpose a publican is represented as praying, "God be merciful to me, a sinner;" and straightway going to his house justified, and consequently with full assurance that his prayer has been heard and answered, and that his sins are forgiven.

For the same purpose also a prodigal son is brought into view,

who makes penitent confession of his offences, and prays for his parent's pardon, and is at once forgiven and received into the father's affectionate embrace.

By examples such as these, the Father in heaven assures his children on earth that when they come to his throne of grace they are not required nor even permitted to bring any other offering or sacrifice in order to procure his forgiveness than that which consists of a penitent, affectionate heart and a compassionate, forgiving spirit.

And he who heard the truth from God and told it to man, made it the substance of his preaching, the standard of his practice and the spirit of that prayer which he taught his disciples to offer to his Father and their Father, to his God and their God.

Invested with the authority and power of this truth, the author and finisher of the Christian faith came to call sinners to repentance and a forgiving, man-loving spirit, that so they may be delivered from evil and be brought into spiritual light and life, and with new-born perception and power be enabled to lay hold on the hope set before them, and take to themselves the promise that they shall hereafter be received into the mansions of the Father's house in heaven.

If, therefore, any expressions of Christ or his apostles should seem to indicate that God demands compensation or satisfaction for injuries inflicted on his divine justice by the transgressions of man, and that he requires the compensation to be made by an innocent person becoming substitute for the transgressor, and in the sinner's stead suffering all the punishment due to sin, then such expressions must necessarily, by the very nature of the case, be susceptible of legitimate interpretation which will bring them into harmony with the supreme truth, that for what the Father gives or forgives nothing whatever can be given to him in exchange.

To affirm that God demands and receives compensation for exempting sinners from punishment, would be in reality to deny that repentance has any connection with the remission of sins; it would be to deny that the Father ever forgives at all; it would be to deny that his throne is a throne of grace; to deny that the Father of mercies is merciful; and to deny that he has the will and power to pardon his penitent prodigal sons, and receive them into his affectionate embrace.

But a neology such as this it would be as impossible for the Christian religion to present as it would be for the gospel to deny the being of a God.

Read and think, and you shall find that the only true God, the Father, is mercy that can never become merchandize, goodness that can never cease to give and to forgive, and love that can never be limited or lessened by the mistakes and misdeeds of man.

Listen to Jesus and learn of him, and he will teach you so to come to the Father, so to pray and practise, so to worship and work, as to procure the grace of God, the forgiveness of thy trespasses, the peace that the world can neither give nor take away, and the free admission into the kingdom of heaven.

H. C.

RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY AT GENEVA.*

GENEVA, as of old, is again the battle-field of theological controversy. Orthodoxy has not lost much of its passion from the days in which it stoned Stephen, to our own in which it is scourging Colenso. The hand of violence is indeed arrested by the power of public opinion, but the heart of persecution has lost none of its bitterness; it still "stirs up the people" and "breathes out threatenings," though it cannot compass "slaughter." When will our high-priests and prelates hear the divine voice commanding them "not to kick against the pricks"?

A German baron breaks into pious indignation against "Religious Geneva;" a pastoral divine translates and endorses the impetuous outpouring; a reverend professor asks, What is the meaning of all this *celestial ire*? The solution is, that orthodoxy is very much out of temper and more ready to scold than to argue. It is but a repetition of history. The scene shifts, the actors change—the life-drama is always the same.

A generation ago the impetuous Robert Haldane called the Genevan Church "the citadel of Satan;" and the eccentric Henry Drummond denounced its ministers as mounting their pulpits on Sundays "to blaspheme the name of the Lord Jesus Christ." M. Vinet proclaims that the union of the State with such a Church is "a sacrilege and an adultery," the national Christianity "an illusion and an hypocrisy." M. Darby avers that it is "the prostitute of the Apocalypse;" and our German Baron affirms that in Geneva "the gospel was lost" among the accredited preachers, who had "a deep hatred of the evangelical life."

It appears that, among other instruments employed by the zealous orthodoxy of England, a preacher in the open fields has been exhibiting his eloquence in the Canton de Vaud. As he could not make himself intelligible to the people, he was accompanied by an interpreter, who was not always very successful in enabling the orator to be understood. "Many thanks, gentlemen!" says Professor Chenevière; "many thanks for placing us on a level with the Caffres and Algonquins, who cannot read or

* Quelques Mots sur la Genève Religieuse au XIX^{me} Siècle, de M. le Baron de Goltz. Traduite par M. C. Malan, Fils, Pasteur à Hanau et à Gènes. Par M. T. T. Chenevière, D.D. Geneva. 1863.

write, have neither temples nor teachers nor means of instruction; thanks, too, for the specimen of the missionaries you send them!" This is rather bitter; but something must be allowed to the becoming pride and high mental culture of the Swiss people.

It would appear that the Evangelical Alliance has not lost sight of the apostolic maxim to be "*all* things to *all* men," so that at all events *some* may be rescued from perdition. The articles of belief which this body has circulated have been judiciously adapted to various localities. In London, the Professor says, the "mobile faith" is represented by fifteen articles; for the Prussian mind it is reduced to ten; but to accommodate itself to Swiss inferiority, only five are circulated at Geneva. When the authorities liberally allowed the cathedral there to be used for enunciating the doctrines of the Alliance, the quintuple conditions were proclaimed in three languages. This, no doubt, was deemed a concession to a Church which imposes no forms of faith, but it did not serve to conciliate the consistory, or to give to the aggressive movement a popular character. It could not be very satisfactory to the Swiss clergy to hear themselves and their flocks arraigned and condemned in the very seats of their authority and influence, judged and sentenced by intrusive strangers to whom they had been extending an unusual hospitality.

It does not appear, however, that any great success has attended the expenditure of a good deal of money, the preaching of many sermons, the dissemination of multitudinous tracts. The number of persons reported by Baron de Goltz as belonging to "*la Genève religieuse*" is "700, of whom 550 are communicants." Whether this is a satisfactory return for the diffusion of "*tant de fiel dans des âmes dévotes*," may by some be doubted. For ourselves, we believe there is health in "the moving of the waters."

We do not propose to enter upon the Geneva controversy, which in its principal outlines is resembling that which occupies the whole religious world. The Geneva Church denies the equality of the Son with the Father, the Godhead of the Messiah, the orthodox doctrines of original sin, the atonement, election and reprobation, and final damnation of sinners; but we would not pass over one passage in which Professor Chenevière recommends to the attention of the Baron, who has proclaimed his adhesion to Calvinism, the commentary of his master on the text, "Suffer little children to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." Calvin thus annotates—"The perversity of man has made the very nature of children odious and abominable in the eyes of God; that nature is ever producing new fruits, as a furnace vomits flames." (Instit. ii. 11.)

MOSES AS A NATURALIST.

INCIDENTAL to the direct and highest interest possessed by the Scriptures as the records of Divine Revelation, is that which belongs to them as records of man,—of his progressive states of civilization, manners and customs, knowledge and belief, in the various times and places in which revealed religion has visited him. So strongly, indeed, is this incidental attraction to the study of the Scriptures felt by the historian, the man of literature and the man of science, that they unfeignedly delight in the Bible so long as they are permitted to use it naturally, and feel its evident genuineness as a record of mankind to be their attraction to the study of its revelations of religious truth. But when (as is more often the case) they are authoritatively bidden to use its scientific allusions most unscientifically and to accept its histories as if there were no such thing as a philosophy of history, they cease thenceforth to offer their due tribute to theology, either relinquishing the study of the Bible in disgust, or making hollow concessions to religious orthodoxy unworthy of their reputation as philosophers. The larger part of our men of science are content to keep out of trouble, if they may, by pursuing their studies just as if there was nothing in the Bible with which to compare their results.

The Jewish law of *clean and unclean* food is truly interesting to the student of natural history, especially in its medical or dietetic applications; and in this point of view, too, it is chiefly interesting to the theologian, as shewing its historical propriety and uses. It shews us the historical facts as regards the Jewish distinctions of meats, and some at least of the classifications and theories of natural history upon which they were based. And it is curious and interesting to notice how far these classifications have been ratified, varied or supplemented by modern naturalists.

Distinctions of clean and unclean meats were not peculiar to the Jews. They are on record in the ancient histories of many nations, and were generally, if not always, matters of religious observance. The earliest historian of Britain, Julius Cæsar, has recorded that our aboriginal ancestors considered it unlawful to eat the hare, the goose, or the common fowl, though they kept them for amusement. The Egyptians did not eat with foreigners, as is shewn in the history of Joseph, who to this extent made himself an Egyptian towards his brethren. "Every shepherd was an abomination to the Egyptians," apparently because the flocks and herds which he fed for use as food were sacred in the Egyptian mythology. They would not use a knife belonging to a Greek, lest it should have been defiled by the slaughter of some sacred creature. We know how the Hindoos at this day regard it as unlawful to eat with aliens.

Three reasons, not absolutely independent of each other, may be assigned for the adoption of such distinctions of food by Moses. First, they may, to a great degree, have been only the embodiment of previously-existing usages. The Mosaic law, there is no reason to doubt, was to a great extent devoted to the definition and regulation of already-existing practices, both in this and many other matters. So, no doubt, were the laws of other ancient legislators besides Moses. But we still inquire into the probable origin of the customs so defined and settled by law. And a second reason, both for the growth of the ancient custom and for its definition by actual law, no doubt was of a sanitary kind. Clean and unclean meats were pretty nearly equivalent to wholesome and unwholesome ones. Tried even by modern dietetic principles, the arrangement cannot be seriously found fault with; if it errs, it errs on the side of safety; and no doubt it represents in most of its details the belief of the law-giver that certain kinds of meat were wholesome as food and certain other kinds unwholesome. A third reason seems to have been, to erect a palpable religious distinction between the Jews and other nations. It was intended that they should keep themselves to themselves; and nothing so much contributes to isolate nation from nation, tribe from tribe, or sect from sect, as conscientiously-observed differences of food. To suppose that Moses, in instituting or enjoining these distinctions, regarded them as matters of absolute and universal morality, would be to mistake his aim. As Michaelis says: A general who gives a cockade to each of his soldiers, is far from wishing it to be worn also by the enemy; so the Jewish observance of meats was the national *cockade*.

Turning now to the details of Jewish law on this subject, we do not, of course, expect to find an infallible knowledge of all the tribes of animals exhibited or professed, nor a perfectly scientific classification made of them. But we trace principles of classification as acted upon, which shew in many parts the state of the naturalist's knowledge in the time of Moses, and shew it to have been mainly correct; while in other parts we see no classification attempted, and in others, again, we find an incorrect one. Equally interesting are the truths and the mistakes recorded.

The classification is given most fully in Leviticus xi.; more briefly in Deut. xiv. We take the former, and may refer occasionally to the latter for comparison.

Moses makes five classes of animals; namely, quadrupeds, fishes, birds, flying reptiles and reptiles that do not fly. Of course we do not pretend to take this as a scientific classification of the animal kingdom. We do not feel any surprise at his not having clearly laid down the vertebrate and invertebrate divisions, or having failed to anticipate Cuvier and Owen in their

arrangement of orders under the former division, with which he had chiefly to do in defining animals fit for food.

1. As to *quadrupeds*, described as "beasts that are on the earth" (Levit. xi. 2—8 and 27; Deut. xiv. 4—8), the Mosaic distinction is very absolute and simple, though its application to a case or two may seem doubtful. "Whatever parteth the hoof and is cloven-footed and cheweth the cud, that shall ye eat." In Deut. the chief clean beasts are enumerated; they are all what we call *ruminants with hollow horns*. In both places certain animals are declared unclean because wanting the one or the other condition prescribed. The swine is unclean because, though his hoof is divided, he does not ruminate; the camel, the hare and the cavey (perhaps *jerboa* or *marmot*, translated by Geddes the *bear-mouse*), are unclean because, though they ruminate, they have not the divided hoof. But the correctness of Moses has been called in question on the camel and on the hare. The camel's hoof is to a certain extent divided; but it is not the thorough cloven hoof of the ox and antelope species; and Moses, having determined to exclude it from the list, puts it beyond doubt by name,—perhaps as a *cockade*, to distinguish Israel from Esau, who used the camel for food. His ranking the hare (and cavey too) among ruminating animals, betrays, no doubt, a want of exact science; for the hare does not *truly* ruminate; it has only one stomach, and cannot ruminate in the true sense of that term. But anatomists had not examined stomachs in those days; the hare seems to ruminate by the peculiar movement of its mouth; and Moses, having decided that it was undesirable food, specifies it as not fulfilling the cleft-hoof condition, if it does the other. Its exclusion is made absolute beyond cavil.

There can be no doubt that, by these regulations, Moses defined the most unquestionably wholesome food. Knowledge and experience verify the rule that the ruminants with hollow horns are the best suited for human food. Experience says that pork is far from wholesome (especially in hot countries); and experience places the digestibility of the hare and rabbit far below that of the permitted class. Nearly coincident with the distinction hit upon by Moses, is that of graminivorous and carnivorous (or omnivorous) quadrupeds; all the latter at least are excluded, though not all the former are permitted. And this distinction will be found to lie at the bottom of his division of clean and unclean birds. The hare and cavey, it must be observed, are also excluded by verse 29, which comes in somewhat parenthetically, declaring that "whatsoever goeth upon his paws, among all manner of beasts that go upon all fours, those are unclean unto you." All the *rodents* and the *carnaria*—the latter including the plantigrada (bears, &c.), the digitigrada, dogs, hyenas, the cat tribe and the marsupialia (but that they were unknown)—

were thus forbidden. So that Moses seems to have made it plain beyond all doubt what quadrupeds he meant to forbid as food, whether he classified them rightly or not. And his classification was not far wrong as to quadrupeds.

2. The second Mosaic class, we have said, is fishes (Lev. xi. 9, 12). But it is not fishes according to the Cuvierian classification. The words of Moses are: "These shall ye eat of *all that are in the waters*: whatsoever hath fins and scales in the waters, in the seas and in the rivers, them shall ye eat." There is no modern science here of course; no mention of the cetacea as the connecting link between quadruped and fish, nor scientific classification of *pisces* proper and *testacea*, all which are in the waters. But the lawgiver seized a visible distinction which gives safe food and excludes the doubtful. Fish with scales and fins *are* the wholesome ones. Eels and lamprays are not wholesome; shell-fish (which we suppose to be thus excluded) are not wholesome. Many persons have found it so of crabs, muscles and cockles, if not of lobsters too.

3. The third class is birds or "fowls" (Lev. xi. 13—19). It is remarkable that here no attempt at classification is made; no birds are admitted as a class, none are excluded as a class, but all by name. Of course we could not expect to find them ranked in their orders as *accipitres*, *passerinae*, *scansoriae*, *gallinae*, *grallatoriae*, *palmipedes*; but we should have been delighted to find something ranking *pari passu* with the classification before made of quadrupeds. Moses excludes the unclean fowls by name: "the eagle, the ossifrage, the osprey," &c. The names of many of these unclean birds it is difficult, and of some it is impossible, to identify. But the bulk of the known birds are birds of prey (including the fishing-birds); and we trace a distinction here analogous to that prevailing in the definition of clean and unclean quadrupeds: the clean are the granivorous or graminivorous, the unclean are the flesh-eating. The pelican and the swan are among the unclean; it is a question whether the goose and duck were meant to be included by analogy; these mud-wallowing birds are at least on the verge of safe food. The scientific naturalist will forgive Moses for having included the *bat* among his fowls, and will forbear needlessly to ascribe to him scientific inspiration. Perhaps he may thus save the only inspiration really claimed by him.

4. Flying reptiles, or "fowls that creep going upon all four," are the fourth division according to Moses. These (including insects of various kinds) are all unclean except the leaping insects (locusts and grasshoppers), which are here distinctly recognized as legitimate food. This exception is not inserted, however, in Deuteronomy (xiv. 19), where it is said absolutely, "Every creeping thing that flieth is unclean unto you; they shall not be eaten."

5. The fifth class in Leviticus is altogether unmentioned in Deuteronomy. It is "creeping things that creep upon the earth;" a most miscellaneous assortment, including all kinds of lizards and snails, and also the mole and the mouse,—which last two must be allowed again to protest against the folly of those who take the natural history of the Pentateuch to be inspired; but which may be content to know how their ancestors were provisionally classed by the ancients, while somewhat proud of having their just claims fully admitted by Cuvier and Owen to rank among the higher quadrupeds, the one as an *insectivorous carnarium*, the other as a most respectable *rodent*.

Now all this is very interesting to the naturalist of our day, if he may be permitted to be naturalist still, and not forced into alliance with what is called orthodox theology.

So the early biblical ideas of astronomy are scientifically as well as devotionally interesting ever since the Inquisition gave over teaching our Galileos. So the geology of Moses is delightful as an historical and devotional study, provided the Bishops will let us alone. And the demoniacs of the New Testament are a scientific study for medical men and those who have the care of the insane and the deaf and dumb, if no stupid theologian is heard insisting upon an explanation by means of fallen angels. The ethnology of Genesis will never cease to interest those who may improve and complete or even dispute it, if only they may be allowed to treat it as ethnology. And so it is with the natural history implied in the law of Moses respecting clean and unclean meats.

There was a later Jewish naturalist whose knowledge was reputed at least to be very great, king Solomon, who, as is said by his historian, "spake of trees from the cedar that is in Lebanon even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall; he spake also of beasts and of fowl and of creeping things and of fishes" (1 Kings iv. 33). Whether Solomon ever wrote on these subjects we are not informed, but at least none of his works on natural history are extant. Had they been preserved, it would have been interesting to see what progress had been made in classification since the time of Moses. And if Solomon had removed the mouse from the list of reptiles and the bat from the list of birds, what device would bibliolatry have discovered for proving that both Solomon and Moses were inspired on the subject, and both, of course, right in their mutual contradiction!

How is it that those who should be the defenders of religion, the leaders of free thought into its precincts, the consecrators of science and the reasonable expounders of revelation, are always found, as a class, to be its least wise interpreters? Who would have imagined that the question whether Moses was right in believing that the hare ruminates, would be represented by a Bishop of the English Church—who once taught boys to think

clearly, reason rightly and speak honestly—as requiring to be answered in the affirmative on pain of losing all our religious hopes? But it is even so.

The Bishop of Manchester having given expression to one of those exaggerated and unmeaning tributes to the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures which are only excusable in those who never read the Scriptures through, or who never tried to understand what they read,—the following correspondence has ensued, which ought to be embalmed among theological mummies, to be recovered perhaps some few years hence, and then ascribed by learned antiquaries to 1763, the imprint of 1863 on the C. R. being a manifest error of the press. Dr. Colenso is rather wicked in pressing the letter of Leviticus (though according to most orthodox principles), and insisting that the words, “the hare cheweth the cud,” are stated to be the very words of the Almighty, when he might more seriously and more wisely have shewn how the phrase, “The Lord said unto Moses and Aaron,” is never meant to express any such literalism. He coolly appends the testimony of Professor Owen, that the hare does not chew the cud, and then defies his brother Manchester to remain unreasonable. To which Manchester replies in effect: that every line of the Scripture is trustworthy—yet many lines are not; that the hare chews the cud—but perhaps he does not; that it may be the hare that is meant—or it may be some other animal; that perhaps he does chew the cud—or perhaps we ought to read *cheweth not*; that he “declines further correspondence”—but “would fain know” what Natal can say to so conclusive a setting down. Oh, how Religion grieves over such exhibitions in the high quarters of the Church!

Bishop Colenso to the Bishop of Manchester.

“23, Sussex Place, Kensington, W., March 23, 1863.

“My Lord,—In a speech delivered by your Lordship at a meeting of the Church Missionary Society in Manchester, on Tuesday, March 17, and published in the *Manchester Examiner and Times* of March 18, you are reported to have said as follows:

““The very foundations of our faith, the very basis of our hopes, the very nearest and dearest of our consolations, are taken from us, when one line of that sacred volume, on which we base everything, is declared to be unfaithful or untrustworthy. We have, I trust, not been wanting in our duty in remonstrating with the party who has thus offended. I trust it is not thought, because we endeavoured to use words of temper and discretion, that we were backward in expressing the horror and grief with which we viewed what had been done. I have no hesitation in saying that there is no phrase which a Christian or a gentleman could use that I am not prepared to use, in reprobation of the spirit which animates that work.”

“I am glad that your Lordship has thus distinctly raised this question, and thrown down a challenge, which I now take up deliberately in the face of the whole Church and nation. The object of my work is

to shew that the real value of the Bible, as a teacher of Divine truth, is not affected by the unhistorical character of certain narratives, or by other errors in matters of fact, which the progress of critical, historical and scientific research may detect from time to time in other parts of the sacred volume. But your Lordship asserts the contrary, if the report of the speech in question may be trusted; and the above words might be substituted for those which I have quoted from Dr. Baylee and others, to shew that at the present day the most extremely narrow views on the subject of Scripture inspiration are held in the Church, far more widely than is commonly imagined, by persons who, like your Lordship, are filling high and influential positions.

"I would beg, however, to be permitted to ask, assuming that the above words are correctly reported, whether your Lordship does really mean to say that 'the very foundations of our faith, the very basis of our hopes, the very nearest and dearest of our consolations, are taken from us,' when it is declared that such a statement as that in Lev. xi. 6—viz., that the hare 'chews the cud,'—which is there represented as resting upon the authority of the Almighty Creator himself, 'Jehovah spake unto Moses and Aaron,'—is not a 'faithful and trustworthy' account of a very well-known fact* in natural history, and that, consequently, the words in question could never have been really uttered by the Almighty?"

"It appears to me, my Lord, that the persons who, in these days of advancing science, will really be most responsible for 'the very foundations of the faith' of many being shaken, and their finding themselves suddenly deprived, as they may think, of the 'very nearest and dearest of their consolations,' are those who still persist in teaching that the authority of the moral and religious truths contained in the Bible depends upon each single 'line of that sacred book' being 'trustworthy' in matters of scientific or historical fact. And it appears to me also to be, more plainly than ever, the duty of those who desire to maintain a true reverence for the Scriptures to protest against such erroneous and misleading teaching, and, as far as possible, to counteract it.

"I have the honour to be, my Lord, your Lordship's very faithful servant,

"J. W. NATAL."

The Bishop of Manchester to Bishop Colenso.

"Mauldeth Hall, Manchester, April 2, 1863.

"My Lord,—I have to acknowledge the receipt yesterday of your letter, dated March 23, 1863, referring to some remarks reported to have been made by me in the Free-Trade Hall, Manchester, on March 17 last. Without pretending to assert that the words as reported were those actually used by me, though I have seldom to complain of inaccuracy in this respect, I readily and to the fullest extent am willing to adopt them. I wholly believe and assert that 'the very foundations of our faith, the very basis of our hopes, the very nearest and dearest of our consolations, are taken from us when one line in that sacred volume on which we base everything is declared to be unfaithful or untrustworthy.' No man in his senses ever ventured to say that every word

* "I enclose an extract from a note by Prof. Owen: 'The hare does not chew the cud; it has not the stomach of a ruminant animal.'"

in the Bible is precisely and mathematically correct. Language is necessarily imperfect—it is addressed to limited intelligences—it is compelled often to adapt itself to pre-conceived and popular ideas; it was intended in the Bible not to convey precise information on points of science or natural history, but to illustrate the ways of God to man. The passage of Leviticus xi. 6, in which you correctly quote the Authorized Version, as stating ‘the hare, because he cheweth the cud,’ and cite Professor Owen as your authority for the untruth of the statement, will illustrate what I have said above, and also your mode of dealing with Holy Scripture. Grant that the Hebrew word rendered ‘hare’ is rightly translated in our version, still the statement in question was not made to instruct mankind in the natural history of hares, but to assign a reason for a prohibition in accordance with popular belief. So common a book as Smith’s valuable ‘Dictionary of the Bible’ mentions the popular belief that the hare ruminates, and explains the origin of that belief, the peculiar motion of the animal’s mouth. Bartholinus, more than two hundred years ago, noticed the error, and how it was favoured by the peculiar form of the animal’s stomach. I have not Linnæus at hand to verify the quotation, but I see it stated that that great naturalist placed the hare among ruminants. In addressing man, the style is suited to man’s knowledge and ideas. The language may, indeed, be not strictly correct, but the impression conveyed is unequivocally so. Thus ‘the hand of God,’ ‘the anger of God,’ and innumerable other instances. Even the Saviour himself (see Mark vii. 33, viii. 23; John ix. 6, 11), to re-assure, doubtless, the timid and ignorant with whom he had to do, graciously condescended to comply with the long-existing and yet, in the East, prevalent belief that human saliva, especially when mixed with dust, is of virtue against the power of demons and the evil eye. But it is not certain that ‘the hare’ is the animal alluded to. The Septuagint translators use a word which renders this doubtful. Is this evidence on which to convict the author of the book of Leviticus of having put a lie into the mouth of Him who is emphatically the Truth? Is the disseminating such a notion the way to cultivate veneration for His name and trust and confidence in His promises? Where shall we look for these if not in Scripture? How in Scripture if the well of truth is polluted? But are you ignorant that the Vatican manuscript, as published by Cardinal Carafa in 1587, reads ‘the hare because he does *not* chew the cud,’ and that this same reading was also given by Aldus in 1518, by Cephalæus in 1526, and by Melancthon in 1545? This, at least, might lead any one to hesitate before outraging the feelings of others, and perhaps unsettling the faith and hopes of weaker brethren. I decline further correspondence. I adhere to what I have said above, confident that every line of Scripture, if viewed with relation to the subject it really refers to, the state mentally and morally of those to whom it was addressed, and the effect it was intended to convey, will amply bear the pressure of any test applied to it. But I must attend to other duties than a controversy with one who has already been so ably encountered. I have seen with pain your readiness to destroy. I would fain know what you would build up in its place.

“I have the honour to be, my Lord, your faithful servant,
 “The Lord Bishop of Natal.” “J. P. MANCHESTER.”

HOW THE OLD ENGLISH DRAMATISTS USE THE WORD
"ATONEMENT."

THE word Atonement occurs once only in the received version of the Scriptures, and most commentators admit that its original import would be more justly represented by the term Reconciliation. However, that the religious idea commonly attached to the word atonement is of modern origin and unauthoritative, clearly appears from the fact that in writings contemporary with that translation the word is frequently used, and always in the simple, the pure Unitarian sense of reconciliation—the at-one-ment suggested by Dr. Lant Carpenter.

In the Monthly Repository for 1832, some very interesting notes in immediate relation to this subject will be found; and as illustrative of the same principle of interpretation, the following, extracted from the dramatic writings of Beaumont and Fletcher, are worthy of study. Surely such indirect and unbiassed testimony will suffice to prove at the least that at the time when this corrupted and much-disputed word was introduced into our version, its significance was universally understood to be that which we continue to attach to it.

"I have been atoning two most wrangling neighbours."

Spanish Curate, Act iii. Sc. 4.

"Otto, is Rollo now, and Rollo, Otto;

Or, as they have one mind, rather one name.

From this atonement let our lives begin;

Be all the rest forgotten!"

Bloody Brother, Act i. Sc. 1.

"I am satisfied; let Virtue have her due. And yet I am melancholy upon this atonement; pray Heaven the State rue it not! I would my lord Vitelli's steward and I could meet; they should find it should cost 'em a little more to make us friends."

Love's Cure, Act v. Sc. 3.

"'Tis far enough; let us atone it here,

And in a reconciled circle fold

Our friendship new again."

Maid in the Mill, Act iv. Sc. 2.

"Nay, good my lord,

Let me atone this difference! do not suffer

Our bridal night to be the centaur's feast."

Thierry and Theodoret, Act ii. Sc. 3.

"And offer in one hand the peaceful olive

Of concord; or, if that can be denied,

By powerful intercession, in the other

Carry the Hermian rod, and force atonement."

Fair Maid of the Inn, Act v. Sc. 3.

"With the duke your uncle I will make atonement,

And will have no denial."

Fair Maid of the Inn, Act v. Sc. 3.

T. C.

ON THE DATE OF THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS, AND ON THE BROTHER WHOSE PRAISE IS THROUGHOUT ALL THE CHURCHES.

THE First Epistle to the Corinthians was written from Ephesus, where Paul had lately arrived with Aquilas and Priscilla (Acts xviii. 18, 19), and where he had been in trouble from the enmity of the Jews. From thence he goes into Macedonia (Acts xx. 1). We must suppose that on this journey he passed through Troas, and was disappointed at not meeting Titus there (2 Cor. ii. 12). At this time, from Philippi in Macedonia, it is usually supposed that the Second Epistle to the Corinthians was written, as determined by its contents.

It was written from Macedonia (ix. 2) after the riots at Ephesus; it mentions his former letter to Corinth (ii. 3), and his having intended to visit Corinth a second time, but not doing so as he determined not to visit them in grief (i. 15—24). From this it has been supposed that the Epistle was written before the apostle's second visit to Greece (Acts xx. 2). And when he says in his Epistle that he is ready to come unto them a third time (xii. 14), we are told to consider that he was counting his intention as a second visit, and that as yet he had only been once in Greece.

In answer to this view of the case, I propose to consider whether this Epistle may not have been written, not from Macedonia on his journey to pay a second visit to Greece, but from Macedonia on his return from that second visit to Greece. I consider that his displeasure with the Corinthians, mentioned in this Epistle, may have been a reason for his not visiting Corinth, although he had been for three months in their immediate neighbourhood (Acts xx. 3). The seeming contradiction in his words when he says that he had not visited them a second time and is willing to come to them a third time, is satisfactorily explained by our conjecture that on his second visit to Greece he purposely omitted to visit Corinth.

I now turn to the brother whose praise is throughout all the churches, whom Paul sent with Titus from Macedonia to Corinth (2 Cor. viii. 18), and who has not yet been identified with any of Paul's companions. When Paul left Greece, to return through Macedonia to Syria, on his way to Jerusalem with the Greek contributions to the poor, he was accompanied by several friends; "and there went with him Sopater of Berea, the son of Pyrrhus, up to the borders of Asia; and of the Thessalonians, Aristarchus and Secundus; and Gaius of Derbe, and Timothy; and of Asia, Tychicus and Trophimus; these [two] went on before and tarried for us at Troas" (Acts xx. 4). Here, then, we remark that Sopater did not enter Asia with Paul and his companions. He turned back at Philippi, or some other town at the border of Macedonia. I venture to conjecture that Sopater is the brother

whose praise is throughout all the churches,—that is to say, the Greek churches known to the Corinthians; that Titus had at this time, and not before, rejoined Paul from Corinth; that Titus was now sent back to Corinth with Sopater, the highly-praised brother; and that after this the Second Epistle to the Corinthians is written. This will be better explained by the following table of the order of events:

Acts xix. 1. The apostle Paul arrives in Ephesus.

First Epistle to the Corinthians is written, promising to visit Corinth a second time after Macedonia.

Acts xix. 9. The troubles in Ephesus.

At Troas, on his way to Macedonia, he had hoped to find Titus from Corinth (2 Cor. ii. 12).

Acts xx. 1. He goes into Macedonia.

Now he may here have met Titus (2 Cor. vii. 6); but I think not.

Now he may have sent Titus and the brother to Corinth (2 Cor. viii. 18); but I think not.

Now the Second Epistle to the Corinthians mentioning these circumstances may have been written; but I think not.

Acts xx. 2. Paul goes into Greece, and spends three months there.

From displeasure with the Corinthians (2 Cor. i. 23) he may have avoided that city.

Acts xx. 3, 4. He goes into Macedonia with several companions.

At Philippi, Titus probably joins him from Corinth (2 Cor. vii. 6).

From thence he sends back Titus with the highly-praised brother to Corinth (2 Cor. viii. 18).

Acts xx. 4. Here, before entering Asia, Sopater turns back, and may be supposed to be the highly-praised brother.

The Second Epistle to the Corinthians was probably written at this time, mentioning his having purposely avoided to visit them a second time, which may be well understood to mean that he had lately been in their neighbourhood without visiting them, and mentioning his willingness to come a third time.

By this arrangement we remove two difficulties. As Acts xx. 2, which tells us that the apostle visited Greece, does not say that he went to Corinth, we are at liberty to understand from the Epistle that a future third journey thither would only be a second visit to the Corinthian church. And, again, we make the Epistle send back Titus from Macedonia to Corinth with the brother, at the time that in the Acts Sopater quits Paul, who thus may be that brother.

S. S.

THE NEW THEOLOGY.*

THAT the theological horizon of England is more than overcast with clouds—that the storm has already begun to rage—that the thunder is heard, the lightning seen, and the rain felt—few probably will deny. At such a time, every party naturally looks first of all to its own tent or dwelling-place to ascertain whether it will stand the brunt of the tempest,—whether it will protect those who have trusted to it in the hour of danger,—and whether it will be a sufficiently capacious asylum for those who are driven out of their own homes.

There never was a time in the history of religious opinions when so many expressions escape of discontent with the old forms of orthodoxy. The Church of England has its Essayists and Reviewers and its Colenso. The storm of which the latter divine has been the occasion is now at its height. The straitest and most orthodox of the Nonconformist bodies has its freethinking troublers, whom it knows not how to endure or how to get rid of. The Quakers of England have been shaken to their very centre by internal schisms and controversies; and the effect of these things, combined with the movement towards the so-called *Evangelical Church* inaugurated by the late John Joseph Gurney, has been a very great numerical reduction of this useful body of Christians. That the Unitarian church has not escaped the pelting storm is manifested by the appearance of a lecture by our good friend Mr. Scott Porter, directed against what he calls the *New Theology*.

We are scarcely disposed to adopt this designation. He states some reasons, indeed, which shew that he does not regard the opinions which he opposes as new. He looks upon them as simply the re-appearance, under new terms and forms, of the deistical and irreligious spirit which broke out with no small virulence in England and France in the last century. This is his account of the genesis of the scepticism which is now affecting many systems of faith and several religious organizations :

“The ‘New Theology,’ as it is called, is not new at all. It is said to have come to us from Germany; but neither is that quite true. It had its origin among the deistical writers of the last century in England. It crossed the channel into France, and was largely disseminated by Voltaire and the sceptical philosophers who paved the way for the Revolution in that country. Thence it spread into Germany, and was embraced, about the latter part of the last century and the beginning of the present, by several men who were appointed Professors of Theology in some of the universities of the German states. From these

* The New Theology : a Lecture delivered in the Church of the First Presbyterian Congregation, Belfast, on Sunday, February 8, 1863. With an Appendix. By John Scott Porter, one of the Pastors of the Congregation. 8vo. Pp. 28. London—E. T. Whitfield. 1863.

teachers it spread among the students, who, in time, became the ministers of the Protestant churches in Germany; and from them it has returned to these its native regions, and has been accepted as if it were quite a new discovery. We sometimes do not know our own old clothes when we see them on the limbs of a stranger; and, with our usual admiration of everything that comes from abroad, we applaud them as of the newest cut and most elegant fashion!"—Pp. 5, 6.

We doubt whether the freethinkers of England exercised the influence ascribed to them on the religious thought of foreign nations. The scepticism which now excites attention has, we imagine, very little theological foundation. It is altogether philosophical in its origin. Unfortunately, while there has been an increasing attention to philosophy, there has been a very general neglect of theology. The consequence has been that where theology and philosophy have been put in conflict, the preference has been given to the latter. The systems of philosophy prevalent both in Germany and England at the present time are essentially sceptical. Even where theology is professedly studied, the study of it is postponed. The previous philosophical training has done its work; the student finds there is no such thing as theology. When under such influences the attempt is made to combine the study of philosophy with the profession of theology, critics are quick in detecting the inconsistency between the doctrines advocated by the philosopher and the sentiments in religion professed by the divine.

We should therefore be rather disposed to call the system of opinions about which Mr. Porter writes, "The New Philosophy" than "The New Theology."

And when it is deliberately proposed to weigh philosophy against theology, or at all events to mould the theology to the philosophy, we feel ourselves entitled to take a preliminary objection to such a course. What has philosophy yet done for the world? It has exercised and trained many subtle and some very powerful minds; but it has done little in discovering and settling *truth*. Everything is matter of discussion and dispute. Philosophy has hitherto settled nothing. Indeed, some noted philosophers gravely argue that certainty would paralyze the study of philosophy, that speculative truth is only of value as it is a means of intellectual activity. A philosopher of this school does not chiefly seek knowledge or truth, but simply the exercise of his faculties and feelings. If he were assured of the full and final possession of speculative truth, he would regard the consummation as the last and worst calamity that could befall him.

Now religion and theology, though they have suggested many questions on which mankind have reached no satisfactory conclusion, have decided some matters of supreme importance to man's welfare. The Bible teaches us the being and the perfections of the Supreme Ruler. The New Testament gives us a

code of morals purer and more practical than ancient philosophy ever taught. We cannot consent, then, to give up theology, the theology of the Bible, and its certain good, for the possible good which philosophy may bestow upon us. We think the end more important than the means; truth more valuable than mere logic. Philosophy has been advocated by one of its most gifted professors as the best intellectual gymnastics. Suppose this granted. The writer to whom we are alluding (the late Sir Wm. Hamilton) admits that health and strength are the important results aimed at. But why may we not carry the process a little further, and say health and strength are valuable as means to an end, the end being personal enjoyment and useful activity? And in like manner, mental training and intellectual power are valuable just in proportion as they help to put us in possession of TRUTH. Apart from this they may be pleasurable, but they are not useful.

To return now to our first subject, the storms of the religious world. When old creeds and dogmas are being bowed to the ground and rent in twain, the simple faith of the Unitarian Christian ought to exercise important influence. In order to our rendering the kind of service best suited to our powers and most needed by others, two conditions should be fulfilled: 1, *we must be free*; and 2, *we must combine with our freedom a pure and rational faith*. When men are flying from theological dungeons and thumbscrews, they will not thank us for offering them shelter on any conditions inconsistent with true freedom. Others may promise them freedom equal to, nay greater, than ours. The atheist can promise licence of thought and action too, without a check save that which man's mental and physical frame imposes. We cannot offer boundless freedom like this. But we can promise all the freedom which can consist with a virtuous life and with a rational faith. But we have a faith. We believe in a Gospel which is, we think, worth our preaching and worthy of other men's acceptance. If other men, and some who take our name, find little in the gospel which they care to preach, nothing so satisfactory to their intellect and affections as their philosophy, they must have liberty to follow their own convictions. But the exercise of their liberty is not to be made an occasion of throwing chains around us. We think the advocates of extreme opinions in our midst have scarcely realized to themselves that compliance with some things they ask exacts a surrender of the religious liberty of those whose conclusions stop short of theirs. We will illustrate this by quoting first a passage from the lecture before us:

"To understand what is meant by 'the New Theology,' we must first take a glance at the 'Old Theology' to which the New is opposed, and which the New Theology is intended to replace.

"Now the Old Theology,—what St. Paul would have called the Old Gospel,—the Gospel which he had delivered to the Galatians, and which

he had received from the Lord Jesus Christ,—was all based upon one fundamental principle,—namely, that *Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ of God*. In his own words, ‘Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ.’ (1 Cor. iii. 11.) That Jesus is the Christ, the Messiah, the Anointed of God, his chosen Messenger and special Ambassador to our race;—that he spake God’s word and revealed God’s mind to the children of men, is the very foundation stone of the church, as it was planned and built up by the first propagators of the Gospel. Elsewhere he is called the ‘chief corner stone, by which the whole building, compactly held together, groweth unto a temple, holy unto the Lord.’ (Eph. ii. 20.) In plainer language, we are told that God ‘hath given him to be head over all things to the church,’ (Eph. i. 22 :) and more plainly still, ‘There is One God and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus.’ (1 Tim. ii. 5.) This is the essential principle of the Gospel which Paul had preached to the Galatians, and which they had received and embraced.”—Pp. 4, 5.

Now the preacher whose mind is penetrated with Christian truths like these, is encountered, we will suppose, by one of his flock holding the sceptical notions of the new philosophy. The latter charges his minister with dogmatism and bigotry for perpetually referring to and insisting on the old foundations of Christian faith. When his pastor speaks of miracles, and especially on the crowning miracle of revelation, the resurrection of Christ in the body, the freethinking hearer protests against the demand made upon him for faith in miracles, and asks, since they cannot agree on that subject, that it shall be at least an open question, and shall not be pressed from the pulpit. He perhaps adds, “I am willing to be a worshiper with you; I am even prepared to accept Christianity, but not a miraculous Christianity.” Compliance with such terms would of course reduce the gospel preached to the scanty creed of the hearer. In short, Christianity would be as authoritative as any system of philosophy, and no more. It would lack every divine sanction. Nor would the concession necessarily or probably stop here. New doubts and new scepticisms would arise, and would still further circumscribe and limit the gospel preached. The practical result would be the denial of free thought and free speech to the preacher. He could only utter that which the most sceptical of his flock consented to believe. What minister of religion that values Christianity and respects himself would consent to hold his office for a day on such terms?

But the freethinking hearer perhaps says, “I wish to be, I believe I am, a Christian, although I am not prepared to accept your exposition of Christianity. When you lay down miracles, and especially the miracle of the resurrection, as an essential article of faith, you virtually deny me any right to the Christian name.” The right-minded and kind-hearted pastor will be slow to unchristianize any man. He knows that it is not his province to judge his brother. But he must speak out his whole thoughts

on the nature and evidence of the gospel. He is to preach Christianity as he understands and accepts it, not as other men believe it. Those that hear him have an equal right to judge for themselves, and to accept or reject his judgment.

It is not correct to say that, while preserving the religious liberty of the pulpit, we take away that of the pew. For, let it be remembered, our argument relates not to societies established for the acceptance and discussion of any and every system of thought, including deism and atheism, but for the inculcation of Christian doctrine and the practice of Christian worship. Most of our societies were established by our forefathers, and are accompanied by a trust. However open the trust may be, there is still a foundation principle. Our Presbyterian trusts generally scrupulously respect religious liberty. But the trust is practically for the preaching of Christianity,—a free Christianity,—a Christianity as free at least as the New Testament,—unrestricted within the narrow precincts of a creed. This circumstance of necessity restricts in some degree religious liberty, and affects alike the pulpit and the pew. No man is qualified or entitled to enter a pulpit affected by a virtual trust like this, who is not prepared to worship God and on Christian principles. The atheist and the deist are both in their several degrees in a false and dishonourable position when they take upon themselves the functions of Christian teachers and pastors.

Consistency and truth require that there should be certain recognized principles. There must be a foundation, but charity and respect for the rights of the many demand that it shall be a broad one. The bond of union in a worshipping assembly must be mutually understood. The articles of faith recognized in their assembling together need not be numerous to be in harmony with the records of Christianity. The being and perfections of God must be admitted. Under the head of the perfections of God we should perforce include the Divine Unity and Benevolence. The divine mission of Christ is another essential principle. To these we must add the certainty of a future judgment. He that unreservedly accepts these principles is, if he is otherwise intellectually and morally qualified, fit to teach from a Christian pulpit. He who cannot accept them may be in other respects a wise man and qualified to teach, but he cannot be in this state of his belief a teacher of Christianity.

Sometimes the expediency of positive Christian teaching, on the part of a minister whose duty it is to address a mixed audience, containing sceptics as well as believers, is discussed. The topic is a delicate one, but, if it be handled both truly and kindly, no mischief, we think, can ensue from it. We have already intimated our conviction that the Christian minister is not faithful to his office if, in deference to the wishes of any of his hearers, he deliberately suppresses the statement of any one essential

Christian doctrine. To demand this of him is, we repeat, to violate his religious liberty. If such were the policy pursued by any society, it would cease to be distinctively Christian. The result would be a great loss of moral power and spiritual influence. The strength of a machine is no more than the strength of its weakest part, and care must be taken that the power of our religious associations is not reduced to the weakness of their most sceptical elements. What the proportion of sceptical hearers may be, either in our own or other religious societies, is a question for the solution of which there are no available facts. If their scepticism is matter of regret, surely it ought to be matter of satisfaction that it is not so far-going as to cut them off from the wish to join in worship of some kind, or to destroy sympathy with Christian morality. Their attendance may be surely taken as meaning something more than an unwillingness to appear singular. They who, though sceptical in some of their views, attend on Unitarian worship, are certainly above that suspicion; for the same dread of singularity would lead them to the crowded church or the orthodox chapel, rather than to the "fit audience though few" generally accorded to us. Their attendance may be interpreted into an expression of their wish, since they cannot find an exact representation from the pulpit and in the worship of their own ideas, to go where they can have a large amount of truth with the smallest intermixture of superstitious error. The inability of the avowed deniers of revelation to sustain for any long time any system of worship and public teaching is a significant fact. It shews that men cannot live on mere negations. There must be some belief if there is to be an enduring bond of union. Let this result of experience and its practical conclusions be well laid to heart by our Unitarian friends. And, again, the craving, on the part of those who have not been led to accept revelation, for some kind of worship, and for the practical morality usually taught by Christian ministers, is an important concession. It is an admission that for themselves or their families they experience a want which religion alone can supply.

The attendance of sceptical hearers on Christian ministrations has therefore its compensations as well as its inconveniences. If the minister be faithful to his high position, it will not affect his earnest inculcation of truth. The consciousness that he speaks on some subjects to unwilling ears and unsympathizing minds, may enkindle his zeal and enlist his whole moral and intellectual strength in the defence of important truth. He will never allow himself to transgress that charity which is the *bond of perfectness*. If he seeks to confute opinions which some of his hearers hold, he will never give occasion to them to suppose that temper, rather than the love of truth, dictates the attack. As a general rule, we believe that error is best supplanted by proving the antagonist truth. Openly assail an opinion held by another man,

and his self-love and his pride of consistency array his thoughts and feelings against you. Hence powerful arguments and persuasive words may be of no effect. Not every minister, therefore, will feel it to be his duty to express from the pulpit his disapprobation of Paulus, Hegel, Strauss, Theodore Parker and similar writers. While we say this, we would not for a moment be understood to imply a censure on Mr. Scott Porter for preaching and publishing the lecture now before us. He doubtless felt it to be a duty to express in public his disapprobation of the infidelity contained in some of their writings, and he has discharged his duty in a manly and very able way.

We greatly regret, for the sake of truth and the reputation of our religious body, the unseemly misrepresentations and censures to which the delivery of this lecture has exposed him. The publication of the lecture became a necessity in consequence of the mistakes and erroneous statements of some unfriendly hearers. But once for all let us assure our Irish friends on both sides, that the harsh words now and then flung at them make little impression on the minds of their friends in England. We are as little disposed, let anonymous correspondents and others write what they may, to believe that those on the one side are *persecutors* and *inquisitors*, as that those on the other are deists or sceptics.

We would earnestly counsel our friends in Ireland to disencumber as entirely as possible their controversies of personalities. They are useless; they are most damaging to truth. We wish we could think that the English friends who have meddled with the fray had always avoided them.

While generally commending Mr. Porter's lecture, we must be allowed to express a feeling of regret that he admitted into it the passages (p. 13) in which he refers to private conversations, in the course of which one minister avowed his admiration for Hegel, and another declared himself a pantheist. Such references are derogatory to the dignity of the pulpit, and are moreover always open to the suspicion that they do not represent the whole views of the speakers referred to. Could they speak in their own behalf, they would perhaps make other and modifying statements which would give to their words a less offensive meaning.

One word, in conclusion, as to the best mode of stopping the diffusion of unsound and unwholesome opinions amongst our congregations. It is too large a subject to be fully discussed in this connection. It involves the whole question of our religious literature, the training of our youth in religious knowledge, and the kind of instruction and influence which prevail in our academic institutions, and especially those which are designed for the education of young men for the ministry. That there is need, to meet the wants and dangers of the age, of a much larger

amount of purely *theological* instruction, and that the quality as well as the amount must be improved, is our firm conviction. The fault of the manifest deficiencies in this matter does not always rest with our ministers. Parents not seldom withhold their help at home, and are not always forward in placing their children under direct personal religious influences. A great change, and one for the worse, has come over our body in this matter since the days of Priestley. But how, it is anxiously asked by some, are our pulpits to be effectually guarded? How are men holding deistical, pantheistical and other extreme and disqualifying opinions, to be kept out of them? Our answer is, By making our congregations more earnestly Christian in opinion and sentiment, and by giving our students for the ministry a sound but perfectly liberal *theological* training.

Much as we prize our Christianity, we cannot consent to give up, seemingly in its behalf, that religious liberty which our forefathers have handed to us. We will be no parties to the introduction into our academies or churches of a creed. We trust unhesitatingly to free inquiry to find out eventually the truth, and to the rectitude of the human mind to put upon truth its rightful value.

The sense of honour will, we doubt not, in time to come, as in time past, keep out of our pulpits unbelieving men. A creed will prove no barrier to any man who lacks the sense of honour. However carefully worded, a creed is apt to present most difficulties to them that are most intelligent and conscientious. In writing thus, we express, we believe, the universal feeling of Unitarians in England. If any of our friends in Ireland see the subject in a different light, it is our earnest hope that they will weigh it impartially and calmly, and, divesting their minds of every prejudice and all personal feeling, seek a course of united action which, while it shall promote Christian fidelity, shall not interfere with religious liberty.

CODEX SINAITICUS.

MORE than three years have now elapsed since the theological and literary world was startled by an announcement of the acquisition by Professor Tischendorf of a very ancient, and consequently very precious, manuscript of the Greek Scriptures. In a letter printed at the time in several English periodicals, he gave a graphic account of the somewhat romantic circumstances under which this invaluable discovery had been made. In 1844, when visiting a monastery at the foot of Mount Sinai, he had found "in a basket" several leaves of a MS. of extreme antiquity which

he saved from destruction, and subsequently printed at Leipsic under the title of Codex Friderico-Augustanus. At the same time he found good reason to believe that a great deal more, if not the entire remainder, of the manuscript was in existence, and both then and during a second visit made in 1853, sought diligently to trace and obtain it, but without the least success. Happening, however, again to re-visit Mount Sinai in 1859, he learnt in the course of a conversation with one of the officials of the same monastery that the monks really did possess a very ancient MS. of the sacred text. On further examination, this turned out to be the missing Codex. It is unnecessary to quote here Tischendorf's expressions of his delight at the re-discovery of so precious a treasure, which he had long given up for lost; suffice it to say that he used every effort to render it available for the cause of biblical criticism, and ultimately succeeded in securing it for the Russian government, which presently announced its intention of giving it to the world. The well-known palæographical skill and critical acumen of M. Tischendorf seemed a sufficient guarantee for the value and antiquity of the manuscript, and the fulfilment of this promise was eagerly expected. In the summer of 1862, the MS. was seen at Leipsic by two well-known English scholars, Mr. Henry Bradshaw and Dr. Tregelles, and both unhesitatingly endorsed Tischendorf's judgment as to its age and importance. It is but fair, with subsequent events in view, to remember that at this time no doubt had been thrown on its genuineness; but still the important fact remains, that a careful examination of the manuscript itself excited no suspicion whatever in the minds of two thoroughly competent and independent palæographers. Dr. Tregelles' opinion was expressed in a private letter, which the friend to whom it was addressed communicated to the *Guardian* newspaper, where it duly appeared in print, serving only to heighten and stimulate the anxiety felt by all interested in biblical science for the appearance of so ancient and important a text. Shortly afterwards, the *Guardian* published another letter, which excited, naturally enough, the greatest astonishment at the time, and has since given birth to a controversy of vital interest to the entire world of biblical and palæographical students. Dr. Constantine Simonides affirmed that this supposed ancient and venerable Codex had in reality been written by himself in 1840! A few weeks afterwards, the *Guardian* and the *Literary Churchman* received letters, signed Καλλίνικος Ἱερομόναχος, purporting to be written from Alexandria, corroborating in the most circumstantial manner the details which Simonides had furnished of his performance, and accusing Dr. Tischendorf of having stolen the leaves which he printed in 1846, and of having obtained the rest of the MS. in 1859 under false pretences. These two letters, the contents of which are almost identical, are all the evidence

which has been brought forward by Simonides, on whom, be it remembered, the *onus probandi* really rests, and who certainly cannot be said to have made out a very strong case. Still the matter is one of such overwhelming importance that not even a semblance of doubt should be allowed to exist upon it if it can be removed by any amount of investigation. In the first place, then, the *details* given by Simonides have all of them an air of the wildest improbability. He tells us that at the age of nineteen or twenty (to adopt the latest and least improbable version of the story), and in the space of eight months, he learnt the science of palæography and the practice of caligraphy, and wrote—without, he says, any intention to deceive, but merely that the monastery might be able to make the present it wished to the Emperor of Russia—a complete copy of the Holy Scriptures in uncial letters and antique style, which (without any special effort on his part) was so admirable an imitation of the old models as to deceive the most expert palæographers of western Europe. Then the internal evidence is certainly by no means in favour of Simonides' theory; for if he wrote the whole with the intention only of producing a beautiful book, whence come the corrections "of various hands and various ages," as Dr. Tregelles calls them, which it contains? How, in particular, comes the statement at the end of the second book of Esdras, and again at the end of Esther, to the effect that the Codex had been compared with a copy corrected *in the autograph* of the martyr Pamphilus? Simonides was asked at Cambridge, "Have you at Mount Athos the very copy which Pamphilus himself corrected?" He was, says the questioner, disinclined or unable to answer the query, but returned next day with a tale that they had not the original but a transcript of it, thus confessing to having twice committed an inaccuracy which it needs a very large share of charity to believe *accidental*, if indeed he wrote the MS. at all. The fact which has been urged against the genuineness of this MS., that no other known Codex of equal antiquity contains *the whole* of the New Testament, cannot surely be held to prove it impossible that one hitherto unknown might do so and yet be of no later date than is indicated by its appearance. Indeed, it does not convince us even that there may not be another buried somewhere else of yet greater completeness. Reverting now to the only external evidence, the letters of Kallinikos, inquiries have recently been made at Alexandria, and this Hieromonk has yet to be heard of there. He has been styled a sort of Mrs. Harris to Simonides; and truly a Greek monk who, though aware, at the time of their alleged committal, of the delinquencies of which he accuses Tischendorf, did not make them known even when the culprit was again in the country and endeavouring to obtain the rest of the MS.,—who has spoken of them to no one until, after a lapse of eighteen years, their disclosure might serve

Simonides' turn, seems a *Deus ex machina* such as is not often met with out of the realms of fiction. Still more doubt is thrown upon the testimony of Kallinikos by a comparison of his handwriting with that of Simonides, and of his paper with that used by the same gentleman. Few unprejudiced judges will, we think, be found who can doubt, on seeing them together, that the handwritings are identical and the material of precisely the same manufacture.

We have purposely confined ourselves to the direct question at issue, avoiding as much as possible all extraneous matter. But the controversy has taken a much wider range than space will permit us to indicate. We have endeavoured only to set down as fairly as possible the main points of the assertions and arguments on both sides, with the object simply of enabling readers previously unacquainted with the question to come to some sort of conclusion on its merits. The matter is one which must interest every one who thinks the text of the New Testament of the least value or importance. It is of vital moment to the cause of sacred literature, and we have the greatest satisfaction in knowing that it is in good hands, and will not be allowed to rest until every doubt be removed, if indeed any still remains to be cleared up.

G. M. G.

ORIGINAL LETTER OF REV. THEOPHILUS LINDSEY.

[This valuable letter has been kindly communicated to us in the original by Mr. H. A. Bright. We append a few illustrative notes.—Ed. C. R.]

To William Tayleur, Esq., Shrewsbury.

DEAR SIR AND MY MOST HONOURED FRIEND,

SOME allowance I am sure will be made for my long silence, when I mention that for this last month I have had a friend almost continually with us out of the country, and further, that our new chapel, to which you have been the most generous benefactor, is to receive us on Sunday next. Indeed, I can take little to myself in this respect; for the whole labouring oar has laid upon my wife, of contriver, executor, &c. &c., and she has been this whole week seven or eight hours each day on the spot, to see everything done and despatched as it ought to be. She has the zeal and the intelligence of any of our most enlightened reformers. She was my great encourager and support from first to last, and so continues. So much I could not help saying by the way.

You gratify me much by acquainting me with your method of attending on public worship, so as not to hurt your own mind by a compliance with what you cannot approve in it. The inter-

pretation you adopt of Chrysostom's prayer in the evening service is not strained. Was I in your situation, I could make myself entirely easy by acting as you do. You bear open testimony against the things you disapprove. It cannot but be known and observed, and will have far more effect than an entire separation and non-attendance on divine service. It will excite inquiry, and thereby contribute to bring some to the truth. And it will induce the indolent and unbelieving to think that religion may be a reality and worthy of a rational mind.

Some friends of mine and acquaintance of the good Bishop of Carlisle think that he has by no means vindicated his own conformity in his allegations in the *Critical Review*, as it is well known that for some time past from being an Arian, he is upon the verge of Socinianism. The same arguments that he uses would justify his continuing in the Romish communion.

I do not know whether I mentioned that some amicable letters which have lately passed between Dr. Price and Dr. Priestley are intended for publication, as soon as Dr. Price has leisure to finish his part.

I am told that the tract against Dr. Priestley lately advertised for Dodsley, is written with a good intention, but with no philosophical exactness. If our friend (Mr.) now Dr. Jebb could find leisure, I do not know the man living more capable of throwing light on that still difficult subject. But at present his time is wholly taken up. I think, however, that within this month past that he looks much better than for a year past, which you will rejoice to hear, for he is one of the excellent ones upon earth. I will take the liberty to pass by without notice one part of your letter till I write again, which I trust will be soon, that I may have space to transcribe the resolutions relating to our chapel lately agreed upon by a meeting of such of the benefactors as could attend. In the mean time, I remain, with a most sincere respect, your truly obliged and affectionate

T. LINDSEY.

Agreed—1. The seats in Essex chapel to be let at no less than one guinea in any pew (back row of the gallery excepted), and the pews in like proportion; the rents to commence at Lady-day next, and one year's rent in advance to be paid on taking.

2. That the stipulated price of seats shall not exclude voluntary donations.

3. That the pew-keeper be absolutely prohibited from ever taking money for letting in strangers, under the penalty of losing his place.

4. That if the rent of pews or seats be in arrear six weeks after the expiration of the year, the same to be considered vacant if the rent be not paid immediately after notice in writing.

5. That a member of the society attend in the vestry-room an hour before and an hour after service, for three weeks before and

six weeks after Lady-day, annually, to receive the rents and subscriptions for seats and pews.

In my next shall be sent an account of our numbers, pews taken, &c.

London, 25th March, 1778.

William Tayleur, Esq.

Of this excellent man, the friend and munificent patron of Mr. Lindsey and Dr. Priestley, an interesting account is given by Mr. Belsham in his *Life of Lindsey*, pp. 138—140. He was one of the founders in 1783 of the Society for promoting the Knowledge of the Scriptures, which published two valuable volumes of Commentaries and Essays, 1785—1799. To him Dr. Priestley dedicated his *Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever*. In an interesting letter of Dr. Priestley's, written from Northumberland, America (May 18, 1802), he gratefully records his privilege in the friendship of men like Mr. Lindsey, Dr. Price and Mr. Tayleur, and adds, "I consider it as my greatest happiness and praise to have had the friendship of such men as these." Mr. Tayleur died May 6th, 1796, in the 84th year of his age. Nearly sixty years before this date he had, as he stated to Mr. Lindsey, been clearly convinced that the Father alone ought to be worshiped as the only true God. In addition to the support of Unitarian worship at Essex-Street chapel, Mr. Tayleur had the happiness of introducing and endowing similar worship at Shrewsbury.

Bishop Law.

Dr. Edmund Law, born at Cartmel, N. Lancashire, 1703, was educated at Cartmel and Kendal Grammar-schools and at St. John's College, Cambridge. On taking his first degree, he was elected Fellow of Christ's College in that University. After holding various preferments and filling several important University offices, he was appointed successively to the Archdeaconries of Carlisle and Staffordshire, and, on a vacancy occurring in the see of Carlisle, was, by the recommendation of the Duke of Grafton (then, 1769, Chancellor of the University), raised to the Episcopal Bench. He was in philosophy an avowed disciple of Locke, and published the handsome quarto edition (1777) of his works. He had in 1746, when Archdeacon of Carlisle, published a theological work entitled, "*Considerations on the Theory of Religion*." His explanations of the Christian scheme had been in the first draught of the work constructed on the Arian scheme of Christ's pre-existence. He represented Christ's original state as that of "a Being of infinite glory and perfection, the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature and the Lord of heaven and earth;" his earthly state he described as one in which he "degraded himself from all this power and dignity," and "divested himself of every glorious attribute." In the progress of his opinions he saw reason to discard even the Arian theory. Writing to Mr. Lindsey, Sept. 23, 1783, the Bishop thus expressed himself: "I received the favour of your *Historical View** and read it with satisfaction. You appear to have cleared up all the passages of Scripture usu-

* The full title of Mr. Lindsey's work is, "*An Historical View of the State of the Unitarian Doctrine and Worship from the Reformation to our own Times, with some Account of the Obstructions which it has met with at different Periods.*"

ally alleged in favour of the contrary opinion, and to have exhausted the subject. As a small return for the obligation, I must desire your acceptance of a new Cumberland edition of my Theory, *purged of some ancient prejudices relative to pre-existence, &c.*" An anonymous biographer of Bishop Law (said to be the late Dr. Disney) says of him that "he retained his speculative opinions, without laying, as many are wont to do, an extravagant stress upon their importance, and without pretending to more certainty than the subject allowed of. No man formed his own conclusions with more freedom, or tolerated those of others with greater candour and equity. He never quarrelled with any person for differing from him, or considered that difference as a sufficient reason for questioning any man's sincerity or judging meanly of his understanding. He was zealously attached to religious liberty, because he thought it leads to truth; yet from his heart he loved peace. But he did not perceive any repugnance in these two things.* There was nothing in his elevation to the bishopric which he spoke of with more pleasure than its being a proof that decent freedom of inquiry was not discouraged."

This is a noble character. But justice and truth require it to be said on the other side, that "in remaining for nineteen years a Unitarian Bishop of a Trinitarian Church," he contracted a moral inconsistency which soiled his reputation and injured the force of his example as a witness to evangelical truth. Nor can we see how with consistency a lover of religious liberty can uphold (and by remaining within the pale and ministry of the Established Church he does uphold) subscription to the Book of Common Prayer. It was during the episcopate of Dr. Law that the noted but unsuccessful attempt was made to lighten the bonds of subscription on the clergy; but neither on that occasion, nor when the Dissenters twice applied unsuccessfully for relief from the partial subscription required from them to bring them under the Toleration Act, was Bishop Law's voice audibly raised in behalf of religious liberty. His conduct was in this respect freely animadverted on in a Letter published by Mr. Thomas, a Dissenting minister at Malmesbury. Bishop Law succeeded in laying the foundations of the fortune of his family. One son was Bishop of Chester, and another Lord Chief Justice. The present head of the house of Ellenborough is grandson to the Bishop.

EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY.

IF the evidences of Christianity, their nature and degrees, and even the first elements of the criticism of our sacred books, were made an ordinary part of the instruction of every tolerably educated man, we should be free from those periodical panics which are a disgrace to the intelligence of a Christian nation.—*Bishop Fitzgerald's Essay on the Study of the Evidences of Christianity in "Aids to Faith."*

* This is a translation of the epitaph on a monument erected to his memory in the cathedral at Carlisle: "Dr. Edmund Law, for nearly nineteen years Bishop of this Church, is buried at the foot of this column. He laboured indefatigably to extreme old age in the search and vindication of evangelical truth. He cherished Christian liberty as zealously and successfully as he did truth, because he thought that unless liberty were secured, religion could not remain pure and uncorrupted. He died Aug. 14, 1787, aged 84."

CRITICAL NOTICES.

English Orthodoxy, as it is and as it might be. By G. Vance Smith, B.A., Ph.D., Minister of St. Saviourgate Chapel, York. 12mo. Pp. 93. London—Longman.

THE subjects discussed by Dr. Vance Smith in this thoughtful and interesting treatise are, 1, The Church of England; 2, Congregationalism and Wesleyan Methodism; and, 3, Christian Faith and its Relation to the Mosaic History. These were the subjects of as many lectures recently delivered by the learned author. We must express our thanks to the friends who, after hearing them, suggested their publication.

Dr. Smith declines to accept the platform of church government as deduced by writers of the Congregationalist school from the history of the apostolical churches, on the ground that the apostles themselves did not construct these churches with a view to their long existence, and had no idea of offering a model church polity, inasmuch as they looked for the speedy "end of all things." We are therefore, he argues, free to choose that church system which best harmonizes with the habits and wants of the age. He declines to take the high Nonconformist ground of resisting in every form a national church. He concedes that a portion of the public funds may be set apart for the support of religion, provided that injustice is done to none, and the religious liberty of all is respected. In discussing the characteristics of a truly national church, he pleads that its foundations should be broad and scriptural. The foundations of the Church of England are, in his view, narrow and unscriptural. A rapid historical glance shews that though its orthodoxy has been frequently changed, yet its prevailing spirit in every form has been intolerant and persecuting. The history of the Book of Common Prayer discloses the reasons why some of its doctrines have a moderately Popish, and others a strong Calvinistic tinge. Speaking, therefore, of Church orthodoxy, Dr. Smith exclaims,

"What a curious combination it is, of black, yellow, and red; and how any one, therefore, may see either one or the other of these colours in it, according as he happens to look at it with a mind predisposed to one side or the other." P. 14.

Another objection is, that the existing frame of the Church of England was constructed at a time when the great principle of Christian charity was neither understood nor acted upon. In glancing at the history of the Church in the 17th century, Dr. Smith deploras the loss of the opportunity, such as may never again occur, of re-establishing the Church of England on a broader and more scriptural basis. The Sheldons and Morleys sacrificed every consideration of a higher kind to two objects—revenge on the Puritans and an iron uniformity. Our author shews, by the testimony of clerical witnesses, that the uniformity produced by Church legislation in 1662 is more apparent than real. Many of the clergy reconcile their consciences to subscription by forced and non-natural interpretations of the Articles, the Creeds and the Prayers. He adduces the startling fact that as recently as 1850, when the controversy arose respecting baptismal regeneration, 4000 of the clergy declared to the Primate that the demand of unfeigned assent and consent to all contained in the Book of Common Prayer was a *heavy burthen* on

their consciences. After detailing the questions on which the Evangelical clergy are distressed by their subscription and the state of ecclesiastical law as recently officially declared, Dr. Smith proceeds to argue that, at one point or another, all clerical subscribers are driven to inconsistency and subterfuge, and then remarks :

"Surely it is an evil and portentous example to the nation, that men in the most sacred of positions, shall make professions and promises which they systematically violate. In any ordinary worldly business this could not be allowed. Nor ought it to be allowed in the Church. For this, if any thing, will sap the foundations of the nation's honesty; and do much, in time, to brand us all, in the sight of God, as a race of men who trifle with solemn pledges and vows, in the very service of the temple itself.

"Such, then, is the position of the Established Church. May we not say that, although it calls itself a national Church, it stands upon too narrow a basis; that its Orthodoxy, the product, as it is, of comparatively rude and ignorant times, is not sufficiently in harmony with Scripture, reason, or conscience, to bear the storms and trials of advancing time? to bear the light of increasing knowledge, which, from many sides, God is shedding upon the world, as, year by year, and generation by generation, the world grows older and wiser?"—P. 31.

In his second lecture, Dr. Vance Smith considers the principles of the two most prominent sects out of the pale of the Church, the Independents and the Wesleyan Methodists, and shews how both, though differing from each other in respect to the principle of democracy, have imitated the Church in establishing orthodox systems, definite statements of doctrine selected by their leaders, and imposed on the entire body as symbols of faith. The Independents had in their early history some men who understood and pleaded for freedom. But the modern representatives of Independency have not the spirit of John Robinson when he expressed his conviction that the Lord had yet more truth to break forth out of his holy word. Without requiring subscription to a book or a creed, modern Independents provide by stringent clauses in their trust-deeds that no doctrines shall be preached in their chapels inconsistent with the Calvinistic theology of the 17th century. Independent ministers and congregations have in their model trust-deed a schedule of doctrines from which they must never depart. Some of these are, the inspiration of all Scripture, the Trinity in Unity, original sin and election. In reference to the fettered condition of Independent churches, Dr. Smith remarks :

"My surprise was indeed great, on first learning how carefully and effectually this was done; and when I thought, again, of the way in which Congregationalists are sometimes spoken of, and sometimes speak of themselves, as the advocates of religious liberty! Why, they are the prime movers in that great Society of which every one hears now-a-days, for the 'Liberation of Religion from State Patronage and Control.' Truly there is another sort of liberation of which Religion is equally in need; and our reformers in this case might as well begin at home, before troubling themselves to go abroad to look after the liberation of others."—P. 41.

The Wesleyans gain their end of keeping their churches in an orthodox faith by binding ministers to preach and people to believe only the doctrines taught in Wesley's Sermons and his Notes on the New Testament.

Dr. Smith dwells with considerable force on the inconsistency of

which the orthodox Dissenters of the present day are guilty, and says he has greater hope for the future liberty of thought and of religion from the Established Church than from orthodox Dissent. In this opinion we do not at present see reason to concur. The hierarchy and convocation and the great body of the clergy oppose themselves as one man to freedom of thought and almost every proposed religious reform. There are individuals in the Church who nobly dare to think for themselves, and to proclaim their dissent from some opinions held to be orthodox. But even in their case the Established Church seems to exercise a powerful fascination too strong for their reason. They prove incontestably that, at this point or that, the Church is an error; but they cannot quit the Church. We are far from imputing to them sordid motives. Long-formed habit and strong affection for a Church in which they have worshiped from children, and in which many generations of their ancestors worshiped before them, bind them in outward conformity to a system which their understandings and their conscience reject. The plunge into practical Dissent is too great a shock for them. Thus, where there is one Theophilus Lindsey, there are probably a hundred clergymen who agree with him, but who content themselves with admiring a virtue which they have not the moral courage to imitate. The Congregationalist who has lost his orthodoxy may feel it painful to give up a crowded chapel and join some little flock of reputed heretics; he may feel it a sacrifice to quit a compact and powerfully organized sect; but he can do it. He does not necessarily stand shivering on the bank, afraid to plunge into a stream icy cold.

In his third lecture, Dr. Smith treats on Christian Faith, and incidentally touches on the subject now occupying so much attention in this country, its relations to the Mosaic history. Unlike the mass of theologians, Dr. Smith pleads that the stress of the teaching of Jesus Christ was *doing* rather than *believing*. He confirms his argument by references to the first three evangelists, because in them we have "the most primitive and life-like representation now accessible to us of what Christ was, and of the words and actions by which his short career was distinguished." Dr. Smith thus speaks of the characteristics of the fourth Gospel:

"In John, you have a Gospel written many years later; in a distant part of Asia, far away from the scenes of Christ's life; and in the midst of persons familiar with certain ideas and expressions of the Gentile philosophy prevailing among them; written, we may indeed say, for the use of such persons, as many evidences in the Gospel itself show; and accommodated in some measure to their forms of expression."—P. 64.

Dr. Smith thus meets the objection of those who think that Paul represents *faith* as all in all:

"The New Testament does not any where give us an exact definition of faith. It is easy to ascertain, nevertheless, what the word means, as usually employed by the New Testament writers. We may remember that the great controversy of the primitive age of Christianity was this:—Whether Jesus were the Christ. Many said No, to that proposition, and could not receive it. If Jesus wrought mighty works to shew that God was with him, they did not believe even then, but said that he had a devil, and wrought his mighty works by Beelzebub the prince of the devils. Finally, they crucified him, because he said that he was the Messiah. Some of those who believed this suffered a similar fate; Stephen, for example, was stoned to death. Paul was often per-

secuted for declaring the same thing. After his conversion, the latter was zealous in declaring it; and we read of him as standing up in the synagogues and elsewhere to explain and maintain that Jesus was the Christ, the anointed messenger, the Revealer,—in Jewish idiom, pre-eminently ‘the Son,’—of the most High God. From their assertion of this fact the disciples were called Christians; i.e., *Christ*-ians. ‘The disciples were first called Christians at Antioch,’—maintaining as they everywhere did that Jesus, their Teacher and Master, was the Christ. To admit this, then, was to believe in Jesus, or to believe in Christ. A person who believed it became, by so doing, a Christian. He evidently could not be a Christian without such belief. This was, in fact, Christian faith. It was what we may term the outward sign of a Christian. Of course there might be good and bad Christians. But a man could not be entitled to that name at all, or in any sense, without believing that Jesus was Christ; without at least that degree and kind of faith. Hence the importance of Faith in the days of the Apostle Paul. We see also, very plainly, that it was faith, not in a Creed, but, rather, in a Person; not in any mere set of propositions or articles, such as men have so often set up for belief, as necessary to salvation; but faith in Jesus as the Christ,—faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.”—Pp. 66—68.

Dr. Smith explains,—and on the same principle of interpreting scripture by means of scripture, the obscure by the aid of the plain,—the Pauline doctrine respecting justification, and the connection which exists between the blood or death of Christ and human salvation. He sums up this part of his subject in these words:

“We cannot be wrong, if we reckon as the great essentials of Christianity, Love to God and man, practical obedience to God’s will, and, as the root of these to the Christian, faith in Jesus as the Messiah.”—P. 72.

Dr. Smith thus explains the province of reason in relation to scripture:

“We must use our judgment, our reason, and our conscience, in estimating the present and durable value of the Christian teachings. The Almighty Ruler, we must remember, permits and requires us to do so. Our Lord was born as a man and a Jew, and educated as such, and partook largely of the kind of knowledge, and other influences belonging to his age. We must use our best judgment, therefore, in determining in any doubtful case, how far words and precepts are applicable to our times. Remember, God has caused knowledge to increase in the earth, since Christ’s time; and some ideas prevalent then, and indeed expressed in his own words, may have belonged to the imperfect knowledge of those days, and may no longer be admissible, amidst the better knowledge of our days. Christianity, we must always bear in mind, is, in the most important sense, a ‘reasonable service;’ the homage of our rational nature; and God asks *such* a service from us, not blind belief, or blind assent, as the highest form of service which we can render him.”—P. 74.

These principles he applies to the disputed question respecting the authorship of the Pentateuch, and avows his belief that Moses did not write the Pentateuch as we now have it, and as the Jews had it in Christ’s time. He next illustrates his principles of interpretation by a reference to the question of the antiquity of man.

“The whole system thus set up for perpetual belief centres in Adam, and hangs upon Adam, the first man according to the Book of Genesis, who was created about 6000 years ago, and from whom we are all descended, according to the same authority. Now, what shall we say, when we find that the tendency of all recent discovery, in regard to the antiquity of man, is to shew

distinctly and by proofs that cannot be controverted,* that man began to live upon the earth not only six thousand years ago, but more likely six thousand centuries ago; and, moreover, that the earliest races of men were not at all civilized, but, on the contrary, unintellectual and animal-like in their character and habits? Thus the idea of the creation of a first man like Adam, highly developed in intellectual and moral faculties, in quick succession from whom many of the arts of civilized life originated, as we read in Genesis,—this idea must be greatly modified or abandoned; and, along with it, the whole scheme of so-called Evangelical Theology must be greatly modified or abandoned too." Pp. 77, 78.

The argumentative portion of the lectures is brought to a conclusion by some admirable remarks as to what may be learnt by a comparison of the different systems of religious faith held by Christians, and by the separation of those doctrines in the acceptance of which all agree, from those on which they differ. The whole is wound up by some brief but weighty words respecting one of the essentials of Christianity, which, in the anxiety of men and especially religious teachers to find reasons for conformity to this creed or that church, seems in danger of being pushed out of the roll of Christian virtues, SINCERITY.

We must resist the temptation to dwell on any of the interesting theological questions which these lectures discuss or suggest. We are desirous of doing what we can to induce our readers to give Dr. Vance Smith's work a careful reading; and for this reason we have, for the most part, confined ourselves to a brief analysis of its contents. It shews how a ripe scholar and a liberal critic treats biblical questions, and with what success a well-instructed Unitarian may preserve his faith in the essential truths of the Bible, without sacrificing his freedom of thought in a superstitious regard to its mere letter.

Forgiveness after Death: Does the Bible or the Church of England affirm it to be Impossible?—a Review of the alleged Proofs of the Hopelessness of a Future State. By a Clergyman. 8vo. Pp. 61. Longmans.

It has long been evident that a reaction has set in, in some orthodox quarters, against the popular doctrine of eternal punishments. In many pulpits in the Church of England, for example, the subject is commonly passed over in silence; or else it is treated with such a softening down of phraseology as to take away nearly the whole of the old and terrible interest attaching to it in the palmy days of Calvinism. It is seldom, however, we imagine, that the doctrine is absolutely denied and preached against in the manner of this pamphlet, although review articles may occasionally be let off against it. In the present instance, it is avowedly a clergyman who stands up to utter his earnest words, not of doubt only, but of downright denial and repudiation,—ominous sign of far-gone declension from the ancient orthodoxy; enough, one would think, to make the Bishop of Oxford and all the Bishops believe that the reign, not of Christ, but of Satan and Infidelity, is drawing very near to us!

* "Sir C. Lyell, on the Antiquity of Man. In reference to this work, Prof. Owen has just said, 'I have accepted its best evidences of man's antiquity.' (*Athenæum*, Feb. 21, 1863.)

"Dr. Baylee, of Birkenhead, who holds of the Bible that 'every word, every syllable, every letter is just what it would be, had God spoken from heaven without any human intervention,' will have a fine field, in this new subject, for the exercise of both his learning and his faith."

The tract before us appears to have been called forth by the recent judgment of Dr. Lushington, in which that learned expounder of the gospel of the Established Church declares that the doctrine of eternal misery "is a doctrine of the Church of England which none of her clergy may question." This decision the present writer disputes—whether successfully or not is another question. He is revolted, as well he may be, by the horrible character of the common doctrine. He holds that the latter is not clearly or conclusively taught in the Scriptures; but, above all, that it is not imposed by the Church upon her ministers. Accordingly, the inquiry is pursued under two principal divisions,—that relating to the teaching of the Church, and that relating to the teaching of the Scriptures. On the latter, we shall not dwell at any length. It is enough to say that the subject is treated thoughtfully and with knowledge; while yet there is always too apparent that want of freedom, in the treatment of Scripture, which can hardly fail to characterize the movement of one who is under bond to regard first and chiefly, not the Scriptures, but the Articles and Formularies of his Church.

It is not without reason, therefore, that the writer places foremost in his discussion, what must naturally be a main question, or perhaps the main question, for "A Clergyman." This is, What does the Church teach or impose upon its ministers? He introduces the inquiry with these words:

"It may be said, without fear of contradiction, that this most solemn question has never before presented itself to the mind of the Church as it is doing now. It is important to remember this fact, in considering the authorized language of the Church. The consciousness that a serious controversy exists upon any subject, with persons of the highest Christian character advocating both sides of it, makes a great difference to those who discuss it. On this very question, for example, many clergymen will speak far more hesitatingly and cautiously at this moment than they would have done twenty years ago. The same cause will affect, in a less degree, the most deliberate and important declarations. Now, in former times, disbelief in endless future torment was no doubt occasionally expressed; but it was by the scepticism which denied much else with it, and in the interest of human ease and security. No protest appears to have been distinctly uttered, at least within the bosom of the Church, in the name of God's eternal attributes and of the gospel of redemption and salvation. Such a protest seems to have been reserved for an age in which principles are more habitually drawn out into their consequences, and tested by the whole range of their application. It is reasonable, therefore, to judge of the mind of the Church in such a matter rather by the general method and spirit of its language than by particular expressions, or by the absence of them. But the defenders of the ordinary doctrine will find it necessary to use this consideration quite as much as their opponents."—Pp. 9, 10.

The author proceeds to examine the principal documents of the Church in order. (1.) The Articles of Religion, he thinks, are silent as to the condition of man after death. He mentions, however, the expression in the 9th Article, "deserveth God's wrath and damnation." On this he only observes that "the wrath and damnation of God clearly belong to this life as much as to the next," and that there is no dogmatic statement in the Articles as to the possibilities of the future state. Granting all this, how does it appear that the writer of the Article did not mean eternal misery by "damnation"? for was not such the meaning attached to the word by Calvinistic writers of the 16th and 17th centuries? If such were his meaning, then the Article at least recognizes and implies

the doctrine in question; and one who signs such an Article in the *natural sense* of the imposer, must he not be held by Dr. Lushington to recognize and imply the same?

(2.) Of the three Creeds, only the Athanasian contains any acknowledgment of "everlasting fire." This is the phrase which, as Dr. Lushington holds, binds the clergy to the doctrine that a portion of mankind shall suffer the torments of hell for ever. This of course the Clergyman denies. He tries to shew that the word "eternal," and its related terms, denote rather the *quality* than the *duration* of the future state. Eternal *life* belongs to the present existence as well as to the future. Its opposite, eternal *death*, is in the same relation to us. "We are enabled to conclude that this phrase denotes the condition of souls which are not enjoying 'eternal life.' It is the state of not knowing God, of being out of fellowship with God, the state of darkness and isolation in self. Much misery, much punishment, may attend this state; but suffering is not its essence."

Thus this writer appears to satisfy himself that, even in the Athanasian Creed, "everlasting fire" (which is, he intimates, very much the same thing as *eternal death*) does not mean what to a plain reader, who takes words in their obvious significations, it certainly seems to mean, but that it is equivalent simply to the "wrath of God." And then we are told "God's wrath is against sin. . . . It must be eternal as the nature of God himself. It is the eternal aspect of the Divine nature towards evil. There is nothing more reasonable, therefore, than that if the wrath of God is called fire, the fire should be characterized as eternal."

Such Maurician efforts to establish new meanings appear to us to be little better than trifling with solemn words and solemn themes. They are an example of the evil spirit now so much abroad among the clergy, by which many truthful and upright men are seduced into an outward conformity to creeds and other formulas which they do not really believe. We know who is the great leader of this school,—who, at all events, has led the way in shewing that "everlasting fire" is not what it has been usually thought to be, and that the Athanasian Creed itself is only an expression of Christian charity. It may be well, at the present moment, that he and his followers can thus make peace with the requirements and responsibilities of their position, though we cannot see that it is so. We trust, however, that the day is not distant when a better spirit will prevail; when the essential inconsistency of such subtleties of explanation with truth and conscientiousness will be clearly discerned; and when, if the needed relief and reformation be not forthcoming, they who are reduced to such straits will have the courage to retire from a morally untenable position, and to prefer the gospel of Christ, as expounded in the court of conscience and reason, to the gospel of the English Church as set forth by the Law Courts.

Can "A Clergyman" seriously think that the Heads of the Church of England, either in the time of Elizabeth or in 1662, intended the words of their Creeds and Articles to be explained away in this latitudinarian spirit? And if they did not intend to give such liberty, can it be either just or legal to assume it and exercise it in the manner of this pamphlet? The straightforward course, it certainly appears to us, would be to make every effort to get the law of the Church altered to the exigencies of

the case. Until this is done, it will be inevitable that the assertion of liberty of interpretation, occasionally made by clergymen and by others in their behalf, will be open to the suspicion of being made with insincerity, or with an ignorance which is almost equally culpable.

We will not attempt to follow the present writer into the question of what the Catechism and other documents teach on the subject under notice. We have said enough to intimate our thorough disapprobation of the method of proceeding here exemplified, while yet fully acknowledging the earnestness and ability of the treatise which has called forth our remarks.

Human Corruption: a Sermon preached before the University of Oxford on Sexagesima Sunday, Feb. 8, 1863. By Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Canon of Christ Church. Oxford and London—Parker. 1863.

EVERYTHING that Dr. Stanley publishes is sure to be read. The intrinsic interest of his writings, far more than his position, is the cause of their attraction. Their genial and comprehensive spirit, their human and practical views of religion, and the engaging aspect in which he places subjects of theological inquiry, have a great charm. His Three Introductory Lectures on the Study of Ecclesiastical History, prefixed to his volume on the Eastern Church, to be had also in a separate form, invest his subject with an interest which at once places it, as it really is, in the very first rank of human study. We have now before us a sermon of similar characteristics, which as bearing—like his three recent sermons, entitled “The Bible, its Form and Substance”—on questions at present engaging so large a share of public attention, we shall briefly notice. It is entitled *Human Corruption*; and its text is Genesis iii. 1, 15: “The serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field. . . . And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.” But, as might be expected, Dr. Stanley soon disposes of the old views connected with it. He almost assumes them to be wrong, or at least but human. He speaks of unknown authorship; of how many of our common notions on the fall of man we owe to Milton, how few to the Bible; how the true spiritual signification of the early chapters of Genesis has been lost; how the serpent was *selected as the symbol* of evil, and then graphically describes its characteristics; and in stating his subject, he puts it in the very hypothetical shape of “*what, in the language of Christian theology, is called the doctrine of the corruption of human nature.*” And in his hands what is it? “We often,” he says, “regard this doctrine as the watchword of a peculiar theological school. *It is surely more correct to say that it is a statement of a universal fact in human experience.*” We have emphasized the remark, because it expresses the whole characteristic of Dr. Stanley’s writings, and the key to their general attractiveness. He will see no narrow dogma, but in all theology a general truth. This will surely lead to the unity of the Church. He thus states his present truth:

“There is in the race, in the nations, in the churches, in the families, in the individual characters, of men, a *corruption*, a tendency to go backwards, a tendency in the best qualities to run to exaggeration, to evil, to error, to

sin. Nay, *corruptio optimi pessima*. Not only human nature, but religion; religious institutions, religious feelings, religious zeal; the best gifts of God to men, wisdom, genius, courage, faith; all have their darker side. 'The infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerate.' Words, even the best words, become corrupt and lose their meanings; institutions, even the best institutions, turn into the meagre shadows, and forms, and incumbances, of the substance which they once represented. Everything has its dangers. Freedom is dangerous; government is dangerous. In the lower orders, the poor and the suffering are the classes called dangerous; not less dangerous are the idle, frivolous, insolent classes of the higher orders. Free inquiry is dangerous; and so is opposition to free inquiry. Going forwards is dangerous, and standing still is yet more dangerous. Genius has its temptations and its dangers; stupidity has its dangers no less great. Everywhere the old Serpent lurks; everywhere he is on the watch to dart his fangs into the heel of man; everywhere his subtle poison is at work. Even under the shadow of the Tree of Life, his fascinating eye is upon us; even round the branches of the Tree of Knowledge, his glittering scales are coiled."

After adverting to the danger of the doctrine of human corruption as furnishing a defence of sin, and dwelling on the check to it provided in Christ, "to raise up a new, spiritual, civilized, Christian, heavenly Adam, in the place of the old, corrupt, barbarian, heathen, natural Adam of other days," Dr. Stanley comes to the main substance of his discourse.

"The doctrine of the corruption of man is most practical—for this reason; that it applies not to the worst of mankind, but to the best, to those who ought to be most susceptible of improvement, of instruction, of redemption. It is not by the wickedness of the wicked or the folly of the fools, so much as by the failings of the good, and the mistakes of the wise,—in other words, by the corruption of our best nature,—that the advance of mankind is hindered and retarded. What this doctrine urges upon us is not so much that the bad should strive to become good, or the fools to become wise, as that the good should strive to become better, and the wise to become wiser."

He selects, therefore, four instances which, in very different forms, illustrate *the degeneracy of our best natures*, and prove the possibility and the necessity of resisting such degeneracy.

We pass over the first two, viz. those forms of corruption which beset the innocent pleasures, the jovial, genial amusements of young men, and those to which the terms *corruption* and *corrupt* practice especially apply, viz. the unlawful distribution or bestowal of places of trust; and notice rather the third and fourth. The third is the frightful evil which has arisen in the Christian church from the increased earnestness and zeal respecting religious opinions.

"I mean," says Dr. Stanley, "the vice or sin which is commonly termed the *Odium Theologicum*, or, in plain English, *Theological Hatred*,—the hatred of Christians by each other for their theological opinions, the bitter internecine hatred of those of whom in former ages it was said, 'See how they love one another.'"

A corruption this of a sense deep in the religious heart of man.

"There is," he proceeds, with one of those illustrations from extended travel which give such graphic interest to his writings, "there is in the city of Constantinople a church dedicated to the Divine Peace, 'Αγία Ειρήνη—St. Irene, as it is commonly called. It is this church which, by a sad and singular coincidence, has been converted into the Armoury of the Turkish Empire; and the traveller starts as he sees the implements of war bristling all along

the well-known forms of Christian architecture; the sacred aisles crowded with muskets and bayonets, the holy place of the altar filled with piles of swords, and spears, and battle-axes. Such has been, for long periods of its existence, no unapt figure of the corruption, the metamorphosis of the Christian Church and of Christian theology. Texts of Scripture, Confessions of faith, Articles of peace, Sacraments of love, have often been only or chiefly valued as missiles to throw at the heads of adversaries, as sharp arrows to penetrate the weak points of an opponent's armour, as swords to cut down the rising heresy, or too often the rising truth."

And having adverted to the harsher instances of the past, he observes:

"But the old Adam can hardly be said to be entirely dead within us. The Serpent is scotched, but not killed. Controversy with all its unfair arts, its soul-withering influences, if not here, yet in the Church and world at large, has a spell which is not yet broken. *Disputandi pruritus Ecclesiarum scabies*, was the motto which a pious Christian* of the seventeenth century had written upon his tomb; and the disease, though much abated since the virulence of Luther and Henry VIII., of Milton and Salmasius, has not yet ceased."

We cannot resist adducing the "few homely warnings" against the mischief, which Dr. Stanley gave his audience. They are, indeed, not new, but of great price; and to have been uttered before the University of Oxford, very manly and bold. Some one's ears not very far off would have tingled to hear them. For did not some one say he had not read the Essays and Reviews which in the same breath he was denouncing; and have not very many confessed to the same unenviable distinction? What, then, says Dr. Stanley?

"Let us make at least this rule—*never to condemn a book unless we have read it*. No doctrine for which we are contending can be more certain than this ten thousand times neglected yet most essential duty. Not to have read a book is a safe, decisive, final answer to those who ask you to denounce it or its author. *Let us determine never to condemn in one man the same sentiment which in another we forgive or applaud*. The difference of profession, or rank, or popularity, can make no difference whatever in the right or wrong, the truth or falsehood of the doctrine which you are supporting or attacking. *Let us never judge of one side of the question without hearing or reading the other also*. To hear one side only is most grateful to our natural, carnal indolence—but it is not the course of those who judge righteous judgment, whether in things human or divine. *Let us never impute to our opponents, whether churches, sects, or individuals, intentions which they themselves disclaim, nor fasten upon them opprobrious names which they themselves repudiate*. To do so is an immense temptation; the wound, the annoyance given by a single word—*Papist, heretic, infidel, atheist*, and many another black phrase,—saves us the trouble of a hundred facts and a hundred arguments—but it is not the less a fang of the old serpent's tooth, a sting of the old serpent's rage. *Let us never attack any one without first making out deliberately, carefully, seriously, all the points wherein we agree; and then, and not till then, stating the points wherein we disagree; and stating these also to ourselves no less deliberately, carefully, and seriously, lest after all there be perchance no disagreement at all, or not that which we thought there was*. Bound by these rules, the dragon of controversy would not be altogether strangled, but he would be compressed within very small compass indeed."

After some reference to past controversies, and the futility of human passion they involved, he adduces the strength given us against this

* "Walton's Life of Sir Henry Wotton, I. 272."

species of corruption in the example of Christ. It is an admirable application of it.

"He, too (with reverence be it said), lived in an age of controversy, an age of errors, of superstitions, of doubts. He might, had it been His will, have spent His whole teaching in attacks on the Rabbinical interpretations of the Pharisees, on the fantastic doctrines of the Essenes, on the hard and barren theology of the Sadducees. He might have done this, and His whole gospel would then have been a controversial gospel,—useful possibly in some small degree to that age, for all coming ages wholly and totally unavailing. He did nothing of the kind. He left these mountains of errors untouched, unrebuked, unrefuted. Once only for a moment did He turn aside to rectify the negations of the Sadducees; twice or thrice, only for a moment, to argue with the traditions of the Pharisees. *Moral* hatred there was in Him, burning and intense, against oppression, against injustice, against idle luxury, against grasping covetousness, against persecution, against hypocrisy, against profaneness, against uncharitableness. But *theological* hatred there was not. Theological hatred there was not; controversy there was not. But there was true Theology. There was that in Him, which subdues, soothes, attracts, conquers evil by good, error by truth. There is that in Him, which raises, elevates, enlightens, because it is in a sphere which controversy hardly reaches, and which critical research can never take away. He is our Peace and our Redemption, because He is also our Righteousness, our Sanctification, and our Wisdom."

This brings the preacher to his fourth and last instance of human corruption,

"— which even more than any other touches our noblest qualities, because it blends itself with some of the highest aspirations to which Christ himself has called us. Wisdom—knowledge—the ambition—the noble ambition to be as God—this is the high calling set before us alike as men and as Christians. Do not halt in your pursuit of knowledge, in your ardour for truth; 'be wise' (I quote our Lord's own fearless words), 'be wise as the' old 'serpent' himself, more subtle than any beast of the field, than any child of man. Yet even in this grand pursuit is the Fall ever at hand. Again and again has this sacred cause been marred by the coldness, or the hardness, or the rashness, or the insolence, of those who else had the future in their hands to save or to lose for generations yet to come. To break with the past, to ridicule and offend the scruples and the weaknesses of the less instructed, to return railing for railing and cursing for cursing, to be driven by persecution and injustice into isolation and exclusiveness and narrowness, this is the natural temptation of reformers, philosophers and students,—this is the corruption which disfigured the Reformation of Luther, which perverted the great mission of Wesley, which poisoned the lofty speculations of France and Germany in the eighteenth century."

Against the fascination of this temptation the strength and support of Christ's example is again had recourse to, also that of St. Paul. Both are admirably put, as standing at the head of greater changes than any of their followers, and yet avoiding the snare. The one fulfilling all the righteousness, even of a decaying and perishing system; the other not to be driven from the position which in him bound together the letter of the past and the spirit of the future.

"That natural temptation which we all feel to look with cynical contempt on the errors we may have left behind, to despise, and to hurt, and to shock the scruples of a weaker conscience and of a less vigorous faith, to treat the feelings of the aged, the ignorant, the poor, as of no account,—this had no

charms for him (St. Paul). 'Who is weak,' we hear him say, 'and I am not weak; who is offended, and I burn not?'"

"Yes," continues Dr. Stanley, "even this last corruption, this last temptation, may be and has been victoriously resisted;" and he then proceeds and concludes in a strain which, with what we have already quoted of this noble discourse, will go very far in the estimation of our readers to vindicate for him the rank which he holds at Oxford, not only as a favourite Professor, but at the same time as by far its most attractive preacher. They will also rejoice with us in the prospect for true religion and virtue when such is the man whom the Queen delights to honour.

"No one can look over the literature and thought of our time and not perceive that the seriousness, the sympathy, the tenderness of the best spirits of the religious world has passed into the intellectual world also. The very combination of the two, which is to some so alarming, is really full of hope. The moral and spiritual aspect of Christianity to which critical and philosophical research most readily turns, gives its warmth, and life, and energy to those who a hundred years ago would have stood entirely aloof and apart. O may God give us grace to seize and to use aright this great opportunity! It may be that He is calling us to higher and holier things for ourselves, for our country, and our Church, than we have ever before witnessed. It may be that the old corrupt nature of this generation will be really transformed more and more into a renewal of the mind of Christ, if only we neglect not so great a salvation. It may be that the years of life which yet remain to us will be charged with interests and hopes even more intense and more thrilling than those through which we have already past.

"In that conflict let each think of his own special temptation. Round every man's own heart is coiled the serpent which he must strangle and subdue.

"Hold on, fail not, be true to your own best selves; overcome evil by good; fight the good fight of faith 'by the Holy Ghost and the power of God, by pureness, by knowledge, by long-suffering, by kindness, by the word of truth, by the armour of righteousness on the right hand and the left, by honour and dishonour, by evil report and good report.' The struggle for our race, for our Church, for ourselves, may be long and tedious, and with many relapses. But sooner or later, in this life or beyond it, 'this corruption shall put on incorruption,' and by those who endure to the end there shall be a glorious and triumphant close. 'There is war in heaven' and war in earth; the war of earthly controversy, the war of our own evil passions in our own most imperfect nature:—'Michael and his angels fight,' and fight 'against the dragon and his angels.' But at last comes the Divine conclusion. 'The old Serpent shall be cast out; and I heard a loud voice in heaven crying, Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of His Christ. . . . And He shall reign for ever and ever.'"*

The Spirit of the Bible; or, the Nature and Value of the Jewish and Christian Scriptures discriminated, in an Analysis of their several Books.
By Edward Higginson. Two vols. Cr. 8vo. Second Edition, revised.
Vol. I. pp. 525; Vol. II. pp. 528. London—Whitfield.

WHEN this very sterling work first made its appearance, we recorded in two separate articles (see C. R., Feb. 1854 and July 1855) our high appreciation of the thoroughness with which Mr. Higginson had exe-

* "Rev. xii. 7—10, xi. 15."

cutted his work; our respect for his frankness in stating difficulties, his critical judgment in admitting or explaining them; and our sympathy with the free but reverent and essentially conservative spirit in which he treated the Bible. By its reception of the work the public seems to have concurred in our favourable verdict. The call for a second edition is just now singularly timely. When, for the first time, the reading public of England are made acquainted with the fact that portions of the letter of Holy Scripture are discordant both with themselves and with the indisputable conclusions of science, it is of supreme importance that the true nature and just value of the Bible should be set forth in its spirit by a discriminating analysis of its several books. There is no little danger at a crisis like the present that men, finding that the old and superstitious claims for the Bible of plenary inspiration and infallible truth are untenable, may rashly conclude that the Bible is altogether untrustworthy and useless as a religious guide. Mr. Higginson will assist his readers to a more discriminating appreciation of Scripture, and protect them from the rash and irreverent contempt for prophet and evangelist, for revelation and miracle, which some shallow declaimers, availing themselves of the apparent authority of men more learned and more in earnest than themselves, seek to inspire.

We do not find in this new edition of Mr. Higginson's book much new or additional matter. This is in part to be explained by the care with which his work was in the first instance put forth, and in part by the circumstance that the first volume, which discusses the questions connected with the Pentateuch, was printed off before the religious world of England was startled by the speculations of Bishop Colenso. But the reader will find in Mr. Higginson's first volume not only a fair statement of many of the difficulties which staggered the Bishop's faith, but a rational solution of them. While wisely declining to commit himself to the theory of Moses being the author of the entire Pentateuch, he sees nothing to hinder his adoption of the view maintained by Mr. Wellbeloved and Dean Milman of the essential antiquity of the Pentateuch, and of Moses being as to its chief portions its author.

How essentially conservative a free criticism of the Bible and its contents may prove, is suggested in a passage in our author's Preface to this edition of his work.

"I feel somewhat strongly that those who have newly popularized Biblical subjects, have not always distinguished so carefully as was desirable, between the false claims which they reject as incumbrances to Biblical belief, and the real claims which the Bible cannot part with if it is to remain a Bible to us. I also think that the 'free handling' of such subjects by men who are bound to the dogmatic creeds of the English Church, is not, nor in the nature of the case can be, thoroughly free on all points, however unrestrained on some.

"These are my reasons for wishing to place a very unpretending yet systematic and (I may surely say) rational view of Scriptural criticism and interpretation before a wider circle of Bible readers."

The cordial appreciation manifested towards Mr. Higginson's book by the religious denomination to which he ministers, is a satisfactory proof that they who tell us, whether as open enemies or professed (but more dangerous) friends, that Unitarians are generally drifting towards the creed, or no creed, of Theodore Parker, understand *neither what they say nor whereof they affirm*. It is not difficult to see the motive which

actualizes those who believe in little or nothing out of themselves, in their wish to annihilate Unitarian Christianity. The more pretentious system of Orthodoxy they can overthrow, but a rational faith, such as the "Spirit of the Bible" discloses, is an immovable breakwater, against which the waves of sceptical thought vainly beat. But the present crisis in the history of religious thought may perhaps awaken our orthodox friends to the conviction that it is scarcely prudent to apply the reproach of infidelity to men without whose aid it may be difficult to defend the common Christianity which is equally precious to all that believe.

We must not close this brief notice of Mr. Higginson's new edition without expressing our satisfaction in observing his announcement of an intended work, entitled, "Studies in Sacred Truth, illustrative of the Harmony of Natural and Revealed Religion, and the Progress of Revelation through Judaism to Christianity."

Stories from the Lips of the Teacher. Re-told by a Disciple. 1863.

OF this pleasant and useful volume, which we owe to Rev. O. B. Frothingham, of New York, we have received copies of the original Boston edition, published by Messrs. Walker and Wise, and of a neat reprint just published by Mr. Whitfield. In expressing a general and hearty approval of this modern version, or rather illustrative commentary, of our Lord's fascinating parables, adapted to juvenile use, we must not be held to adopt every interpretation suggested. Sometimes Mr. Frothingham adds to the lesson truths which did not fall from the lips of the Teacher. Thus in the parable of the Tares, he illustrates the use to which *moral* tares may be put. This is a great truth, but it was not in this connection uttered by our Lord.

The Bible and Modern Thought: Two Sermons. By Thomas L. Marshall. Pp. 35. London—Whitfield.

THESE two sermons, recently preached before the congregation at Brixton, are a timely and popular illustration of the position of the Unitarian church in regard to the great question of the age, the authority of the Bible. "On this great controversy," the preacher remarks, "we Unitarians stand on high vantage-ground, and without any fear of the result we see the ablest divines of other churches gradually approaching our own position, advancing almost as new discoveries the prominent conclusions of our own theologians, and embracing, if not precisely our doctrinal convictions, at least those broad and rational principles of inquiry which must lead to an entire re-construction of the popular system of theology" (p. 8).

The Committee of the Brixton Unitarian chapel are entitled to our thanks for giving these discourses of their pastor through the press to the public.